

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1901.

PHONETIC NOTATION.

THE necessity of representing sounds by letters involves the selection of a set of signs that will indicate unmistakably what are considered to be single sounds. Such phonetic notations are approximated by several languages, the Italian, Japanese, German, etc. In other languages, like the French and English, the system is seriously defective.

A phonetic notation should be based on an attempt to get one distinctly special sign for each sound, or group of sounds, retaining as many letters as possible in their most usual applications in the majority of languages. The attempt should also be made to avoid, as far as practicable, letters that suggest wrong sounds.

A fundamental requirement is that of ready availability. No system can be generally adopted unless it can be readily set up in any large printery. The presence of even one character not found in the type-founder's catalog makes the system practically impossible; it is too much to ask that new types shall be moulded or that types be broken for a single occasion.

The letters and symbols that regularly appear in the usual font of type are given in the following list with the approximate relative number of each beside it.

a 8500	r 6200	á 100
b 1600	s 8000	é 250
c 3000	t 9000	í 100
d 4400	u 3400	ó 100
e 12000	v 1200	ú 100
f 2500	w 2000	à 200
g 1700	x 400	è 100
h 6400	y 2000	í 100
i 8000	z 200	ð 100
j 400	& 200	ù 100
k 800	fi 500	á 200
l 4000	ff 400	é 200
m 3000	fl 200	í 100
n 8000	ffl 100	ó 100
o 8000	ffi 150	ú 100
p 1700	æ 100	à 100
q 300	œ 60	è 100

í 100	3 1100	Y 300
ö 100	4 1000	Z 80
ü 100	5 1000	Æ 40
á 100	6 1000	Œ 30
é 150	7 1000	A 300
í 100	8 1000	B 200
ó 100	9 1000	C 250
ú 100	o 1300	D 250
à 100	§ 100	E 300
è 150	A 600	F 200
í 100	B 400	G 200
ö 100	C 500	H 200
ü 100	D 500	I 400
ç 100	E 600	J 150
ñ 100	F 400	K 150
, 4500	G 400	L 250
; 800	H 400	M 200
: 600	I 800	N 200
. 2000	J 300	O 200
- 1000	K 300	P 200
? 200	L 500	Q 90
! 150	M 400	R 200
' 700	N 400	S 250
* 100	O 400	T 320
† 100	P 400	U 150
‡ 100	Q 180	V 150
l 150	R 400	W 200
100	S 500	X 90
§ 100	T 650	V 150
(300	U 300	Z 40
¶ 60	V 300	Æ 20
í 1300	W 400	Œ 15
2 1200	X 180	

The additional accented letters that are generally on hand in small quantities in the usual sizes in both Roman and Italic in a large printery are á á ó ú ö ç é t ñ ð s' t' y ÿ ž. German and Greek are also generally on hand. The molds of these characters are present in most type-foundries and any quantity of the type can be obtained upon order.

The letters in a notation for ordinary use must be limited to those of the regular alphabet and such new characters as may be derived from them. A well selected system with these limitations is immediately available anywhere for any amount of printing.

Where the demands on the printery may be more special and various, as in specimens of

phonetic notation in a work printed in the ordinary characters, the notation may be enlarged to include any of the accented letters, superscripts, subscripts and symbols found in the type-founder's catalogs. The number of accented letters carried by the printer is steadily increasing and new ones would probably be added for phonetic notation provided such a notation could first secure general adoption by conforming to the present possibilities.

In preparing the following list of letters I have tried to make it conform in every practicable way to the notation of the "Association Phonétique Internationale;" it may be regarded as a revision of that notation with mainly such changes as are needed to make it practically available. Students of language are deeply indebted to Dr. Passy for his work toward phonetic uniformity; it is to be hoped that the notation which has been developed under his care can be so modified as to be universally acceptable to all who approach the matter in a profitable spirit of compromise. I have felt compelled to avoid as far as possible the use of letters in such a way as to suggest to the American ear a wrong sound; for example, the notation *jard* for *yard* involves an almost irresistible association of the word *jarred*. In this attempt at adaptation I have been greatly aided by suggestions and criticisms from Mr. E. H. Tuttle, of New Haven.

The reasons for the selection of most of the characters will generally be apparent without special explanation. Both Roman and Italic forms for the lower case letters are available. The : indicates "long;" the small capitals indicate "strong." The key-words indicate the usual American pronunciation; the Bostonian pronunciation differs considerably and the English widely.

When several characters are given in the list for the same sound, the first is the one regarded as the best for scientific purposes. Such a type may not be numerous enough for its use in a work exclusively in phonetic notation; a thoroughly available substitute is then given in [].

AMERICAN SOUNDS.

- a*,—ah (*a:*).
- v*,—pat (*pvt*).
- d*, [*ɔ*],—halt (*hdlt*).

- b*,—bat (*bvt*).
- d*,—din (*din*).
- ð*, [*d'*],—then (*ðɛn* or *d'ɛn*).
- ɛ*, [*ɛ*],—let (*ɛt*).
- e*,—pate (*pe:t*)
- ə*,—escape (*əske:p*).
- f*,—fat (*fvt*).
- g*,—good (*gud*).
- h*,—hat (*hvt*).
- i*,—fit (*fit*).
- ɪ*,—feet (*fɪ:t*).
- j*,—you (*ju:*).
- k*,—cook (*kuk*).
- l*,—long (*ld:y*).
- m*,—mat (*mat*).
- n*,—pert (*pnu:t*).
- nu*,—noon (*nu:n*).
- ŋ*,—sing (*sɪŋ*).
- o*,—note (*no:t*).
- p*,—pole (*po:l*).
- r*,—trilled tongue *r*.
- ɹ*,—untrilled tongue *r*.
- s*,—seal (*sɪ:l*).
- š*, [*s'*],—shun (*šən* or *s'ən*).
- t*,—tin (*tin*).
- θ*, [*t'*],—thin (*θin* or *t'in*).
- u*,—put (*put*), pool (*pu:l*).
- v*,—vat (*vvt*).
- ə*,—but (*bat*).
- w*,—we (*wi:*).
- z*,—zeal (*zt:l*).
- ž* [*z'*],—vision (*viž:n* or *viz'�*).
- ᵻ*,—undetermined vowel.

ADDITIONAL FOREIGN SOUNDS.

- a*,—Fr. rat (*ra*).
- a"*,—Fr. banc (*baŋ*).
- d"*,—Fr. bon (*bdŋ*).
- β*, [*b'*],—Span. saber (*saβer*), Germ. zwei (*tsβai*), bilabial sonant fricative.
- ç*,—Germ. ich (*iç*).
- v"*,—Fr. bain (*bvŋ*).
- ɸ*,—Jap. Fuji (*ɸuji*), bilabial *f*.
- ʒ*,—north Germ. lagen (*laʒ,n*).
- y*,—Fr. lui (*lyi*).
- i*,—Russ. syn (*sin*).
- ʃ"*,—Port. fim (*fʃm*).
- χ*,—Germ. ach (*ax*), Greek *χ*, Russ. *χ*.
- ʎ*,—Ital. *gl*, Span. *ll*, Port. *lh*.
- ñ*,—Span. *ñ*, Ital. *gn*, Fr. *gn* as in *règne*.
- œ*,—Fr. seul (*sœl*).

α^n ,—Fr. un (α^n).
 \ddot{o} , θ ,—Germ. \ddot{o} , Danish θ .
 ε ,—uvula r .
 u^n ,—Port. um (u^n).
 \ddot{u} ,—Germ. \ddot{u} .
 y ,—Danish y , Fr. u .
 \dot{e} ,—Arab. "ain."
 \dot{a} ,—Arab. "ha."
 \dot{h} ,—Arab. "he."
 $'$,—glottal catch, Germ. an ('an).

MODIFICATIONS.

$:$,—preceding vowel lengthened.
 $'$,—aspiration of preceding sound.
 \circ ,—surd, or devocalized, form of preceding sound.
 $*$,—sonant, or vocalized, form of preceding sound.
 \wedge ,—tongue more advanced.
 \vee ,—tongue more retracted.
 $\wedge\wedge$,—mouth more open.
 $\wedge\wedge\wedge$,—mouth more closed.
 $\circ\circ$,—lips more rounded.
 $\circ\circ\circ$,—lips more closed.
 Superior letters,—modification of the previous sound in the direction of the sound indicated, foxes (*fdksiez*).
 Superior figures,—relative duration, nut (*nat*), note (*no²t*).
 Inferior figures,—slightly different forms of the same sound as defined on each occasion; thus t_1 (interdental), t_2 (apical prealveolar), t_3 (apical alveolar), t_4 (cerebral), t_5 (dorsal alveolar), etc., to denote different forms of t .
 Large letters,—strong sounds, bother (*bAθə*).
 Small letters,—weak sounds, now (*nau*), say (*sei*).
 δ , ρ , σ , τ , etc.,—forms with upturned tongue, used only when considered necessary.

COMPLEX SOUNDS.

$\xi=i\dot{\delta}$,—chair (*ξvər=i\xi və*).
 $\dot{\tau}=d\dot{z}$,—joy (*θdi=dzdi*).
 $m=hw$,—which (*ni\xi=hwi\xi*).

REMARKS.

a , α . This is the notation of the Assoc. Phon. Int. When the notation is Roman, a broken d must be used for a . The difficulties occur mainly in printing French in Roman letters. English has only the first of the two

sounds. When it is necessary to print English in Roman letters, a may be used for a .

d , \dot{a} ,—The combinations A^o , A_o , \ddot{A} , d for this sound have long been in use. The supply of types for the Swedish d is rather limited. The \dot{a} of the Assoc. Phon. Int. seems repulsive in English owing to its association with c .

ε , e , \dot{a} . Without entering into the midst of the utter disagreement of phonetic writers on these sounds it will probably be sufficient to say that ε is the usual American short e , e the similar long vowel, and \dot{a} the common very short indistinct vowel sometimes called the indefinite vowel. The first type is the Greek epsilon [for which turned z may be used]; it is to be highly recommended on account of its legibility.

For capitals only the form E is available; the solution seems to lie in using E as the capital of e , E_2 as that of e .

g , \dot{g} . This corresponds to the most general usage of g ; the turned g for the German sound in *lagen* is appropriate. The corresponding letters of the Assoc. Phon. Int. are not in any font.

j . The letter j for this sound is objectionable on account of its constant use in English (as in *judge*), French (as in *juge*), and German (as in *Jahr*), for sounds that differ from each other. I might suggest the inferior i to avoid this objection and also to suggest the i with which it is practically identical. The j is used by the Assoc. Phon. Int.

r , \dot{a} . In the usual American pronunciation the r is weak or lacking. The r may be heard in an effort to speak a word like *arrow* with a distinct r .

\dot{x} , s^t . The Slavic \dot{x} has been widely used but occurs only as a special accented letter; it may be replaced by s^t when necessary. The sign of the Assoc. Int. Phon. is unavailable.

θ , t^t . This sound of th in *thin* is best indicated by the Greek θ or the Icelandic θ . Its great frequency in English requires a numerous type and may make it necessary to use t^t .

\dot{z} , z^t . The Slavic \dot{z} has been much used. The z^t corresponds to t^t , d^t , s^t . The symbol g has been adopted by the Assoc. Phon. Int.

When the object is not to record the peculiarities of special persons, the vowels

used in distinct speech should be retained; thus the word *resident* would be regularly written *rezident*, and the form *rez.dnt* used only for an actual speech record where the vowel was indistinct.

o. The devocalized sound generally resembles a form for which there is already a letter, but it is not identical with it. Thus Danish *d̄* is a devocalized *d* resembling somewhat, but not completely, a *t*. Wholly or partially devocalized sounds occur in all connected speech.

*.—Sonant forms of usually surd sounds occur in connected speech. Thus a vocalized *k* has been found in words like *aha* (*ah*ə*), a vocalized *k* in *aka* (*ak*kə*).

o v m w 9, 8. These six signs are for corresponding ones of the Assoc. Phon. Int. which are not to be found in the typefounder's catalog.

Large letters. These may be used to mark sounds that are in any way emphatic. The strength may arise from intensity, length or pitch. The ear cannot be relied upon to distinguish between these factors.

Inferior letters. When it is necessary to indicate the weakness of a sound, this method may be used as the opposite of that for strength. The weakness may arise from shortness or faintness. It is perhaps not necessary to distinguish between the two except in indicating the results of measurements; in this case smallness may indicate faintness and the superior numeral may indicate relative length.

β. This is a sound resembling both *b* and *w*, produced by closing the lips more than for *w*, but not completely as for *b*.

an, ðn, ən, əm. Types with the tilde over the vowel would be preferable, but *ə* and *ə* are the only accessible ones.

Melody markings. It is often important to indicate the general melody of sounds with their variations of length, intensity and pitch. This may be done by using "piece accents" above them. The degrees of length are indicated by the number of marks, ' " " ", etc.; the degrees of intensity by the heaviness of the marks, the variations in pitch by the height above the letter, ' ' ' , etc.

Use of the notation. In indicating the peculiarities of an individual pronunciation the various methods may be all employed. Thus, various pronunciations of *hair* would be indi-

cated by *həə*, *həə*, *hər*, *həd*, *həp*, *həə*, *hər:p*, *hər*, *hər*, *vr*, etc. The finest details can be expressed only by giving speech curves and measurements.

In writing phonetically for the purpose of communication, however, all individual peculiarities should be suppressed as far as possible. It is perhaps advisable to use forms that suggest the usual printed spelling even when those forms are the rarer ones; in reading print the eye pictures are the most important parts of the words, and it is a serious matter to throw these away or to have them irresistibly suggest sounds not intended. Anything that can be done as a compromise to the well-founded prejudice in favor of established eye-forms will aid in the spread of a notation.

E. W. SCRIPTURE.

Yale University.

PARALLELS BETWEEN SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS AND A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM.

THE verbal composition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is very remarkable, perhaps almost as remarkable as the original and peculiar composition of the imagery and poetry of the play. The diction in its various parts is as diverse as the conditions of 'human mortals' may be said to differ from those of supernatural propagation. This divergence has its origin in the nature of the play. The characters, incidents, and settings of the play belong to three separate worlds. The first is represented by Theseus, Hippolyta, and the Athenians, the courtly, chivalric world; the second, by Oberon, Titania, and their fairy attendants; the third, by the stupid Bottom and his fellow tragedians. Each of these three worlds has its own language; and the language of the Athenians, in their courtly, chivalric environment, is the only one that has any connection with the diction of the *Sonnets*. Here the conceits and the phraseology in which they are couched have something in common.

In the editions of the *Sonnets*, by Messrs. Dowden and Rolfe, the text has been frequently explained by references from *Midsummer Night's Dream*, but these illustrations are

mostly limited to similarity of words in the texts, rather than to similarity of conceits or phraseology. The following are the cases cited by Mr. Dowden, nearly all of which are repeated by Mr. Rolfe:

Summer's distillation, perfumes made from flowers. Compare Sonnet liv, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act i, sc. ii, ll. 76, 77:

Earthlier happy is the rose distill'd,
Than that which withering on the virgin thorne
Grows, lives and dies in single blessedness.

Beard, compare *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act ii, sc. i, l. 95:

The green corn
Hath rotted ere his youth attain'd a beard.

Defeated, defrauded, disappointed; so *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act iv, sc. i, ll. 153-155:

They would have stolen away; they would, Demetrius;
Thereby to have defeated you and me,
You of your wife and me of my consent.

Being fond on praise, doting on praise. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act ii, sc. i, l. 266:

That he may prove
More fond on her than she upon her love.

Patent, privilege. As in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act i, sc. i, l. 80, 'my virgin patent.'

To set a form, etc., to give a becoming appearance to the change which you desire. So *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act i, sc. i, l. 233:

Things base and vile, holding no quantity,
Love can transpose to form and dignity.

The teeming autumn, etc. So *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act ii, sc. i, ll. 111-114, 'The chiding autumn.'

Few additional words are cited by Mr. Rolfe, of which the following are most important: *Heavenly alchemy*, Sonnet 33, ll. 1-4:

Full many a glorious morning have I seen
Flatter the mountain tops with sov'reign eye,
Kissing with golden face the meadows green,
Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy;

Compare with Act iii, sc. ii, ll. 391-393:

Even till the eastern gate, all fiery-red,
Opening on Neptune with fair blessed beams,
Turns into yellow gold his salt green streams.

Canker, Sonnets 35, l. 4, 70, 7, 92, 4, and 99, 12:

And loathsome canker lives in sweetest bud.

Compare with Act ii, sc. ii, l. 3:

Some to kill cankers in the musk-rose buds,

My home of love, etc. Sonnets 109, 5-6:

That is my home of love: if I have ranged,
Like him that travels, I return again;

Compare Act iii, sc. ii, ll. 171-172:

My heart to her but as guest-wise sojourn'd,
And now to Helen is it home return'd,

Misprision, Sonnet 87, 11:

So thy great gift, upon misprision growing,

Compare with Act iii, sc. ii, l. 90:

Of thy misprision must perforse ensue, etc.

By increasing the list of parallels that may follow, it is not intended to claim any peculiar connection between the *Sonnets* and the play, nor to establish any data by which the time of the composition of either may be determined. Both works were mentioned by Francis Meres in his *Palladis Tamia*, published in 1598. The play has sometimes been assigned to a date as early as 1591. There is nothing misleading in saying that a few years only intervened between the writing of the *Sonnets* and the play.

Two classes of parallels are presented: one, in which the thought or imagery seems to be correspondent, though this may not always be in the exact phraseology; and a second, in which the mere word is sufficiently forcible to attract the attention. The sonnet is first quoted and the play's parallel follows.

Son. 75, 9-10, "Sometime, all full with feasting on
your sight,
And by and by clean starved for a
look;"

M.N.D. i, i, 222-3, "we must starve our sight
From lovers' food till morrow deep
midnight."

Son. 147, 1-4, "My love is as a fever, longing still
For that which longer nurseth the
disease;
Feeding on that which doth preserve
the ill,
The uncertain sickly appetite to
please."

M.N.D. iv, i, 170-3, "But, like in sickness, did I loathe this
food;
But, as in health, come to my natural
taste,

Son. 72, 9-10, "Now I do wish it, love it, long for it,"
"O, lest your true love may seem false
in this,
That you for love speak well of me
untrue,"

M.N.D. iii, ii, 89, 91, "And laid the love-juice on some true-love's sight;"
 Again, "Some true love turn'd, and not a false turn'd true."
 i, i, 134, "The course of true love never did run smooth;"
Son. 137, 1-2, "Thou blind fool, Love, what dost thou to mine eyes,
 That they behold, and see not what they see?"
M.N.D. i, i, 234-5, "Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind;
 And therefore is wing'd Cupid painted blind;"
Son. 113, 1, "Since I left you mine eye is in my mind,"
Son. 148, 1-2, "O me, what eyes have Love put in my head,
 Which have no correspondence with true sight!"

may be compared with the passage just preceding.

Sons. 35, 12; 89, 14; 142, 1; 150, 9-10; all contrast love with hate, so

M.N.D. i, i, 199, "The more I love, the more he hateth me."

Other such conceits of contrast are:

Son. 129, 14, "To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell."
M.N.D. i, i, 207, "That he hath turn'd a heaven into a hell!"
 Again, "I'll follow thee and make a heaven of hell,"
Son. 43, 13-4, "All days are nights to see till I see thee,
 And nights bright days when dreams do show thee me."
M.N.D. ii, i, 218-9, "It is not night when I do see your face,
 Therefore I think I am not in the night;"
Son. 12, 2, "And see the brave day sunk in hideous night;
M.N.D. i, i, 7, "Four days will quickly steep themselves in night,"

The use of the word *steep*, as it occurs here in the play, may aid in the explanation of the same in *Son.* 63, 5,

"when his youthful morn
 Hath travell'd on to age's steepy night;"
Son. 68, 13-4, "And him as for a map doth Nature store,
 To show false Art what beauty was of yore."
M.N.D. ii, ii, 104, "Nature shows art,"
Son. 133, 9, "Prison my heart in thy steel bosom's ward,"
M.N.D. ii, ii, 47-50, "I mean, that my heart unto yours is knit

So that but one heart we can make of it:
 Two bosoms interchained with an oath;
 So then two bosoms and a single troth."
 Again, ii, ii, 105, "That through thy bosom makes me see thy heart."
Son. 94, 11-2, "But if that flower with base infection meet,
 The basest weed outbraves his dignity;"
M.N.D. i, i, 232-3, "Things base and vile, holding no dignity."

The eye being the best reflector of the beauty of the face. It was made the favorite conceit in the *Sonnets*. It is used also in the eloquent speeches of the lovers, in the play. Through the magical influence of love the seeing sense of the eye was confused with the other senses and was made to carry on a sort of warfare with such members as the heart, ear, and with the intellectual faculties.

Son. 113, 1-3, "Since I left you mine eye is in my mind,
 And that which governs me to go about
 Doth part his function and is partly blind."
M.N.D. iii, ii, 177-8, "Dark night, that from the eye his function takes
 The ear more quick of apprehension makes;"
Son. 13, 14, "To hear with eyes belongs to love's fine wit."
M.N.D. i, ii, 234, "Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind."
Son. 148, 1-4, "O me, what eyes hath Love put in my head,
 Which have no correspondence with true sight!
 Or, if they have, where is my judgment fled,
 That censures falsely what they see aright?"
 Again, 14, 1 and 9, "Not from the stars do I my judgment pluck;"
 "But from thine eyes my knowledge I derive,"
M.N.D. i, i, 56-7, "I would my father look'd but with my eyes,"
 "Rather your eyes must with his judgment look."
Son. 20, 5-6, "An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
 Gilding the object where upon it gazeth;"
M.N.D. v, i, 12, "The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling."
 Again, iii, ii, 187-8, "Fair Helena, who more engilds the night
 Than all yon fiery oes and eyes of light,"
Son. 119, 7, "How have mine eyes out of their spheres been fitted."

M.N.D. ii, ii, 99, "Made me compare with Hermia's sphery eyne?"

Son. 14, 9-10, "But from thine eyes my knowledge I derive,
And, constant stars, in them I read such art!"

M.N.D. ii, ii, 121-2, "And leads me to your eyes, where I o'erlook
Love's stories written in love's richest book."

Parallel passages occur where the play upon the word furnishes the element of humor:

Son. 138, 13-4, "Therefore I lie with her, and she with me,
And in our faults by lies we flatter'd be,"

M.N.D. ii, ii, 52, "For lying so, Hermia, I do not lie."

Son. 141, 5, "Nor are mine ears with thy tongue's tune delighted;"

M.N.D. i, i, 183-4, "and your tongue's sweet air
More tuneable than lark to shepherd's ear,"

Son. 18, 7, "And every fair from fair sometime declines,"

21, 4-5, "And every fair with his fair doth rehearse,
Making a complement of proud compare,

M.N.D. i, i, 171-2, "Call you me fair? that fair again unsay.
Demetrius loves your fair: O unhappy fair!"

Son. 134, 8, "Under that bond that him as fast doth bind."

M.N.D. iii, ii, 267-8, "I would I had your bond, for I perceive
A weak bond holds you: I'll not trust your word."

Son. 105, 5-7, "Kind is my love to-day, to-morrow kind,
Still constant in a wondrous excellence;
Therefore my verse, to constancy confined,"

M.N.D. v, i, 26-7, "And grows to something of great constancy,
But, howsoever, strange and admirable."

Son. 105, 1-2, "Let not my love be call'd idolatry,
Nor my beloved as an idol show,"

M.N.D. i, i, 109, "Devoutly dotes, dotes in idolatry,"

Son. 35, 9, "For to thy sensual fault I bring in sense."

This passage has caused some trouble and dispute among commentators. Readers will find an interesting note in *The Poems of Shakespeare* edited by George Wyndham, p. 283. The word *sense* gives the trouble. Malone suggested *incense*; and the parallel now to be quoted from *M.N.D.* ii, ii, 45, would suggest *innocence*, an excellent substitute too.

"O, take the sense, sweet, of my innocence!
Love takes the meaning in love's conference."

Another play upon *sense* is, *M.N.D.* iii, ii, 27-8,

"Their sense thus weak, lost with their fears thus
Made senseless things begin to do them wrong;"

Along with the famed passage upon the distillation of the rose, the first quoted from Mr. Dowden in this enumeration, could also have been cited the lines telling of the roses in the cheek.

Son. 116, 9-10, "Love's not Time's fool, though rosy
lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass
again,

130, 5-6, "I have seen roses damask'd, white and
red,
But no such roses see I in her cheeks;"

M.N.D. i, i, 128-9, "How now, my love! why is your cheek
so pale?
How chance the roses there do fade so
fast?"

Just here it may be said that one of the most common of the conceits in the *Sonnets*, and indeed in many of the plays, is only faintly touched upon in this play; namely, the comparison of dark complexions with light, in a word, the mysterious presence of the Dark Lady. The references are slight and go to show that Hermia had the unfashionable dark complexion:

M.N.D. iii, ii, 257, "Away, you Ethiope!"
and i, 263, "tawny Tartar." And a possible third reference to this occurs in Theseus's speech: v, i, ll,

"See Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt!"

It only remains to add a collection of phrases in which the key-word, not a common word, strikes a peculiar tone suggesting a similarity or harmony of thought in the writer's mind when penning the lines of both the *Sonnets* and the play. These are generally unusual words with no uncertain sound. Often they are surrounded by a verbiage that might suggest a closer parallelism than the one cited here.

Son. 112, 8, "That my steel'd sense or changes right
again,

133, 9, "Prison my heart in thy steel bosom's
ward,"

M.N.D. ii, i, 193-4, "But yet you draw not iron, for my
heart
Is true as steel;"

Son. 113, 6, "Of bird, of flower, or shape, which it
doth latch;"

<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 36,	"But hast thou yet latch'd the Athenia's eyes"	<i>M.N.D.</i> v, i, 2-6,	At random from the truth, vainly expressed;"
<i>Son.</i> 66, 9,	"And art made tongue-tied by authority,"		"More strange than true; I never may believe
again,	85, 1, "My tongue-tied Muse"		These antique fables, nor these fairy toys.
	140, 2, "My tongue-tied patience"		Lovers and madmen have such seething brains,
<i>M.N.D.</i> v, i, 104,	"Love, therefore, and tongue-tied simplicity."		Such shaping fantasies, that apprehend More than cool reason ever comprehends."
<i>Son.</i> 77, 7,	"Thou by thy dial's shady stealth mayst know"	<i>Son.</i> 95, 13,	"Take heed, dear heart, of this large privilege;"
<i>M.N.D.</i> iv, i, 157,	"My lord, fair Helen told me of their stealth,"	<i>M.N.D.</i> ii, i, 217,	"Your virtue is my privilege for that."
<i>Son.</i> 76, 10,	"And you and love are still my argument;"	<i>Son.</i> 85, 13,	"Then others for the breath of words respect,"
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 242,	"You would not make me such an argument."	<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 44,	"Lay breath so bitter on your bitter foe."
<i>Son.</i> 92, 11,	"O, what a happy title do I find,"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 92,	"Thy crazed title to my certain right."		
<i>Son.</i> 44, 14,	"But heavy tears, badges of either's woe."		
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 127,	"Bearing the badge of faith to prove true?"		
<i>Son.</i> 83, 4,	"The barren tender of a poet's debt;"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 87,	"If for his tender here I make some stay."		
<i>Son.</i> 120, 13,	"But that your trespass now becomes a fee."		
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 113,	"Pleading for a lover's fee."		
<i>Son.</i> 125, 14,	"When most impeach'd stands least in thy control."		
<i>M.N.D.</i> ii, i, 211,	"You do impeach your modesty too much,"		
<i>Son.</i> 34, 12, and 42, 12,	"To him that bears the strong offence's cross."		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 136, 150,	"O cross! too high to be enthrall'd to and 153,		
	"Because it is a customary cross,"		
<i>Son.</i> 103, 14,	"Your own glass shows you when you look in it."		
<i>M.N.D.</i> ii, ii, 98,	"What wicked and dissembling glass of mine."		
<i>Son.</i> 7, 8,	"Attending to his golden pilgrimage;"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 75,	"To undergo such maiden pilgrimage;"		
<i>Son.</i> 126, 4,	"Thy lovers withering as thy sweet self grow'st,"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 6,	"Long withering out a young man's revenue."		
<i>Son.</i> 82, 12,	"In true plain words by thy true-telling friend,"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 68,	"O, once tell true, tell true, even for my sake!"		
<i>Son.</i> 66, 11,	"And simple truth miscalled simplicity,"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 171,	"By the simplicity of Venus' doves,"		
<i>Son.</i> 109, 11,	"That it could so preposterously be stain'd,"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> iii, ii, 121,	"That befall preposterously."		
<i>Son.</i> 137, 8,	"Whereto the judgment of my heart is tied?"		
<i>M.N.D.</i> i, i, 236,	"Nor hath Love mind of any judgment taste;"		
<i>Son.</i> 147, 11-2,	"My thoughts and my discourse as madmen are,		

It remains only to quote the sonnet in which the poet refuses to overpraise the beauty of his lady. But a similar tribute of praise is expressed in the play.

Son. 130, 1-4 and 13-4. "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun;
Coral is far more red than her lips' red;
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;
If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head,"
"And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare
As any she belied with false compare."
M.N.D. iii, ii, 138-44. "To what, my love, shall I compare thine eyne?
Crystal is muddy. O, how ripe in show
Thy lips, those kissing cherries, tempting grow!
That pure congealed white, high Taurus' snow,
Fann'd with the eastern wind, turns to a crow
When thou hold'st up thy hand. O, let me kiss
This princess of pure white, this seal of bliss!"

C. F. McCULLUMPHA.

University of Minnesota.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND GERMAN LITERATURE.

I.

THE interesting paper recently published by Professor Hatfield and Miss Hochbaum on the influence of the American Revolution upon German literature¹ calls attention to a subject which has never been treated with anything like the completeness it deserves, a subject

¹ *Americana Germanica*, iii, Nos. 3 and 4.

which is of peculiar interest to the students of German in this country. The first one to emphasize this influence was, so far as I am aware, the well known *Kulturhistoriker* Karl Biedermann. In an article entitled *Die nordamerikanische und die französische Revolution in ihren Rückwirkungen auf Deutschland*,² he shows, by a number of examples, how intensely interested German poets were in the American struggle for freedom. He quotes in full the enthusiastic poem *Die Freiheit Amerikas* which had appeared in the *Berliner Monatsschrift*. In his *Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert* (iii, 169) he also refers to this influence. It is to be regretted that Biedermann, familiar as he was with eighteenth-century literature in its cultured relations, did not treat this subject at greater length.

In the following I wish to show the attitude of German poets and authors towards the American Revolution and its two great representatives, Franklin and Washington. I shall confine myself to such references as are not given in the article in *Americana Germanica*.

Klopstock, always a lover of personal and national liberty, expressed great admiration for the Americans. Besides the two odes *Sie und nicht wir* (1790) and *Zwei Nordamerikaner* (1795) mentioned in *Americana Germanica*, there are several other references to America in Klopstock's works. Biedermann³ believes that the ode *Weissagung* (1773), dedicated to the Counts Stolberg, contains the first trace of the influence of the American Revolution upon Klopstock. This does not seem to me probable. The ode was composed on the occasion of a visit of the two Stolbergs in April, 1773,⁴ more than half a year before the Boston Tea Party. Nor is it likely that, as Biedermann thinks, the ode *Fürstenlob* (1775) shows the influence of American events. Klopstock in this ode gives vigorous expression to the principle which he always practised, not to praise princes simply because they are princes, as so many poets do, but to praise only such princes as are really worthy of praise, like Frederick V. of Denmark, or the Margrave of Baden.

² *Zschr. f. deutsche Kulturgeschichte*, 1858, p. 483 ff.

³ *Deutschland im 18. Jahrh.* iii, 163.

⁴ Dünzter, Klopstocks Oden, ii, 2; cf. Lappenberg, *Briefe von und an Klopstock*, Braunschweig, 1867, p. 248.

In the ode *Die Denkzeiten* (1793), addressed to "Gallia, the slave," Klopstock points to America as an example worthy to be imitated by the French:

Kennte sie sich selbst und des Lernens Weisheit, mit
scharfem
Hinblick schaute sie dann über das westliche Meer. L. 27 f.

In line 8 of the same ode Klopstock says with regard to certain decrees of the French Senate:

Wurden je sie vollf. hrt?
Ich verehre den Thüter, und, gern Mithörer des Guten,
Der die Verehrung gebeut, hält' ich das schöne Gebot.

Dünzter⁵ explains *des Guten* as referring to the noble-minded among the French. Hamel⁶ accepts Dünzter's explanation. Klopstock, however, in a note refers us to an article of his in the *Berliner Monatsschrift* (1796) entitled *Das nicht zurückgeschickte Diplom*. In this article Klopstock gives his reasons for not sending back the diploma by virtue of which he was an honorary citizen of the French Republic.

Among other things he says:

"Ich hielt es (that is, das Zurücksenden) fern
ner auch darum für undankbar gegen die Nation,
weil ich durch sie Mitbürger von Washington geworden war."⁷

Des Guten must therefore refer to Washington.⁸ Klopstock is proud of being a fellow-citizen of Washington. In a letter addressed to Roland, the French minister, dated Hamburg, November 19, 1792, he expresses his gratitude for having been made an honorary citizen of France. One of the things most pleasing to him in connection with this honor is "dass dieses schöne Gesetz mich zum Mitbürger Washingtons gemacht hat."⁹

In a Latin letter addressed to the Duc de la Rochefoucauld, dated June 25, 1790, he speaks of Lafayette as "imperatorem Washingtoni amicum."¹⁰

Franklin's name occurs in a letter to C. F.

⁵ l. c. ii, 174.

⁶ *Klopstocks Werke*, iii, 189 n.

⁷ *Sämtliche Werke*, Leipzig, 1855, x, 349.

⁸ As I have not access to all the Klopstock commentaries, I cannot say whether this has been pointed out before.

⁹ Schmidlin, Klopstocks *sämtliche Werke ergänzt*. Stuttgart, 1839, I, 370, 372.

¹⁰ Lappenberg, l. c., pp. 333, 524.

Cramer, dated Hamburg, December 10, 1782.¹¹ Klopstock, during the later years of his life, spent much time and thought upon the reform of German orthography. Cramer may have called his attention to similar efforts on the part of Franklin, for Klopstock says in this letter: "Wär kan anders über di Orthografi denken, als Franklin und ich?"

The ode *Der jetzige Krieg* (1781) cannot be called a glorification of the American Revolution. Though it refers to the great war between England on the one hand, and France, Spain, Holland and the American colonies on the other, it treats only of the European theatre of war. Klopstock does not praise the war because one side is fighting for liberty, but because both sides seem to hesitate about shedding human blood. That is to him a sign that the spirit of humanity is modifying the cruel warfare of former times.¹² From the modern point of view the ode may be called naïve, but Herder, who also dreamed of an era of universal peace, called it "eine Prophetenstimme der Zukunft."¹³

Herder took great interest in America. He felt strongly drawn towards Franklin. There is a certain spiritual kinship between the two men. Franklin is mentioned by Herder for the first time, it seems, in *Zerspreute Blätter* (1792).¹⁴ Herder speaks of him as "*ein hochachtungswürdiger Mann*;" then he continues:

"die Wissenschaft des guten Richards enthält einen solchen Schatz von Lebensregeln, dass man in mancher Rücksicht fast aufs ganze Leben nichts mehr bedürfte."

At the end of the book he gives a free translation of Bishop Berkeley's well-known poem on "Arts and Learning in America." In his comments on this poem Herder speaks of "*das aufstrebende Amerika*," but he is sure that for Europe, too, a new day is dawning.

Franklin is mentioned again in the second and third of the *Humanitätsbriefe* (1793). In the fourth letter Herder refers to Schlichtegroll's necrology of Franklin (Gotha, 1791). The letters were written under the influence of the

¹¹ Lappenberg, I. c., p. 308.

¹² Dintzer, I. c., ii, 35, 36.

¹³ *Humanitätsbriefe*, no. 20. Suphan, *Herders Werke*, xvii, 93.

¹⁴ 4, 137; *Herders Werke*, ed. Suphan xvi, 23.

French biography of Franklin.¹⁵ This book circulated among the friends of Jacobi and Schlosser, and had been sent to Herder by one of the ladies. It seems that the letters had originally been intended for the *Freitagsgesellschaft* at Weimar, a literary society before which Knebel, at a previous meeting, had read a "*moralische Rhapsodie*," in which Franklin's name had been mentioned.¹⁶ Herder's friend, Fr. Jacobi, was also much interested in Franklin. The royal library at Berlin has several volumes of Franklin's works bearing the mark "*ex bibliotheca Jacobi*".¹⁷

In 1794 (Febr. 26) Herder writes to Heyne at Göttingen:

"Darf ich Sie bitten, bester Freund, um gütige Mitteilung der neulich in England herausgekommenen Franklin'schen Sammlung von Aufsätzen?"

After mentioning Bertuch's translation of these essays he continues:

"Sie nennen sich Aufsätze im Geschmack des Spectators und sind, irre ich nicht, im vorigen Jahre erschienen. Die Sammlung in 4. unter dem Titel: *Political, Miscellaneous and Philosophical Pieces*, by B. Franklin, London, 1779, besitze ich mit mehrern Stücken, . . . Und das *American Asylum* legen Sie wohl zugleich gefälligst bei; wenn viele Teile sind, einen oder zwei Teile."

In Heyne's reply (March 10, 1794), Franklin's book is mentioned. On the second of March Heyne had sent Herder six volumes of the *Columbian Magazine*.¹⁸

In the *Beilage* to the fifty-seventh of the *Humanitätsbriefe* (1795), Herder compares Franklin with Socrates:

"Socrates hatte seinen eigenen Genius, der nachher nicht oft, aber doch hie und da z. B. in Montaigne, Addison, Franklin u. a. wieder erschienen ist."¹⁹

It is interesting, in this connection, to note a French opinion of Franklin; the historian Lacretelle relates: "This venerable old man,

¹⁵ *Mémoires de la vie privée de Benj. Franklin*, Paris, 1791.

¹⁶ Suphan xviii, 539-42; Haym, *Herder*, II, 485 f.

¹⁷ Suphan, I. c.; Fr. Jacobi's *Auserlesener Briefwechsel*, ii, 111.

¹⁸ Or Herder to Heyne? Dintzer und F. G. von Herder, *Von und an Herder*, Leipzig, 1861, ii, 223, 225.

¹⁹ Suphan, xvii, 295.

it was said, joined to the demeanor of Phocion the spirit of Socrates."²⁰

In his discussion of popular poetry (*Adrasteia*, 10. Stück, 1803) Herder quotes a letter written by Benjamin Franklin to his brother, Hrn. Johann Franklin, at Newport in New England, concerning the merits of a certain ballad.²¹

Herder's attitude towards the soldier traffic may be seen from the bitter verses in the poem *Der deutsche Nationalrhum* originally intended for the *Humanitätsbriefe* (1797), but, doubtless for political reasons, withheld from publication until 1812.²²

Und doch sind sie (die Deutschen) in ihrer Herren Dienst
So händisch-tren! Sie lassen willig sich
Zum Mississippi und Ohio-Strom
Nach Candia und nach dem Mohrenfels
Verkaufen, Stirbt der Sklave, streicht der Herr
Den Sold indess: und seine Witwe darbt;
Die Waisen ziehn den Pflug und hungern.—Doch
Das schadet nichts; der Herr braucht einen Schatz.²³

References to the American Indians and to the negro slaves may be found in several places.²⁴

Schiller published his first poem *Der Abend* in 1776. The opening lines of this ode run as follows:

Die Sonne zeigt, vollendend gleich dem Helden,
Dem tiefen Thal ihr Abendgesicht,
(Für andre, ach! glücksel'gre Welten
Ist das ein Morgenangesicht).

The ode is full of reminiscences of Klopstock, Haller, and the Old Testament prophets, but the third and fourth lines, according to Boas, are original with Schiller: they contain an allusion to the American struggle for liberty.²⁵ Boas' suggestion has been accepted by Biedermann.²⁶ It has much in its favor. In 1781, when Schiller was editing the *Nachrichten*

²⁰ Parton, *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, Boston, 1867, ii, 212.

²¹ Suphan, xxiv, 268; *B. Franklin's Works*, ed. John Bigelow, New York and London, 1887, iii, 392. The letter here is addressed to Peter Franklin at Newport, 1765.

²² Suphan xviii, 208, 211.

²³ Cf. also Biedermann in *Zschr. f. deutsche Kulturschichte*, 1858, p. 490.

²⁴ Cf. *Negeridyllen*; *Humanitätsbriefe* Nos. 114, 116-119; Suphan, xiii, 239 ff.

²⁵ Schiller's *Jugendjahre* von E. Boas. Herausg. von W. v. Maltzahn, Hannover, 1856, i, 120.

²⁶ *Deutschland im 18. Jh.*, iv, 597, n.

zum Nutzen und Vergnügen, he openly showed his sympathies for America. Boas says in regard to this:²⁷ "Schillers Zeitung persiflierte die unwahrscheinlichen Siegesberichte der Engländer." Brahm²⁸ says:

"Derb werden die Engländer verspottet, wegen ihrer prahlischen Bulletins im Amerikanischen Befreiungskriege."

Minor²⁹ says:

"Ohne eine feste Stellung einzuhalten, kann die Zeitung Schillers ihren Spott über den gesunkenen britischen Löwen nicht unterdrücken."

It is a strange irony of fate that Schiller's own family should have been mixed up with the soldier traffic. His father, while stationed at Lorch (1763-66), secured recruits for the Duke of Württemberg that were afterwards sold to Holland. Schiller's sister Christophine relates that the officers at first did not know what fate was in store for their recruits,³⁰ Schiller's god-father and distant relative, Johann Friedrich Schiller was an agent in Hesse and Württemberg for the purpose of obtaining troops for Holland's foreign possessions. Later he went to England, where he seems to have served the British government in a similar capacity. Here he translated Robertson's *History of America* and dedicated it to Queen Charlotte (1777),

"die Georg's Sorgen für das Wohl seiner Zeitgenossen, durch die Bildung seiner würdigen Familie zu Menschenfreunden, versüsst, und auf dem Throne kein höheres Vorrecht oder Vergnügen fühlt, als den Menschen wohl zu thun."³¹

Garve, the well-known *Popularphilosoph*, was very anxious to translate Robertson's book. He writes to Chr. F. Weisse, from Breslau (March 12, 1774):

"Wenn Robertson's Geschichte von Amerika herauskommen wird, das wäre etwas für mich zu übersetzen."³²

Later he writes (March 11, '75):

²⁷ I. c. i, 235.

²⁸ Schiller, Berlin, 1888, i, 169.

²⁹ Schiller, Berlin, 1890, i, 483.

³⁰ Brahm, I. c., i, 29; Minor, I. c., i, 23.

³¹ Boas, I. c., i, 51 f.; Biedermann, *Deutschland im 18. Jh.*, iv, 626.

³² *Briefe von Christian Garve an Chr. F. Weisse*, Breslau 1803, i, 59. Cf. also i, 85.

"Ich weiss nicht, was ich so gern übersetzt hätte, als den Robertson. Ich schätze ihn so hoch—ich denke ich würde es erträglich gut machen—und weg ist er. Das wäre das Buch, das ich übersetzt hätte, ohne es zu kennen, weil ich nicht glaube, dass er etwas mittelmässiges schreiben kann. Und Amerika ist jetzt ein so wichtiger Weltteil! Wie in 200 Jahren sich die Gestalt der Dinge verändert hat!"³³

Joh. Fr. Schiller's translation was not altogether satisfactory. Zollikofer in 1779 (Febr. 19) writes to Garve:

"Und nun kommt schon wieder eine Korrektur von Robertson's Geschichte von Alt-Griechenland. Schiller in London hat sie übersetzt, und seine Sprache ist öfters undeutsch. Diese Fehler soll ich ihr benehmen, so wie wir es mit seiner Geschichte von Amerika gemacht haben."³⁴

Not a few German writers followed Klopstock and Herder in their sympathy for the American Revolution and in their admiration for Washington and Franklin. These two men were the only ones among the leading men of the Revolution whose names became thoroughly familiar to the German public. Men like Hamilton and Jefferson seem to have been practically unknown except to the few. This condition of things, it must be admitted, has continued to the present day: the average German—we may say, the average European—connects only the names of Franklin and Washington with the American Revolution.

Lichtenberg, the great satirist at Göttingen, speaks of Franklin as "der grosse Franklin."³⁵ In his diary written during his stay in England (1774-75), he says:

"Ich habe selbst jemanden sehr unparteiisch die Rechte der Amerikaner verteidigen hören; er sagte: das glaube ich, das ist meine Meinung, allein wenn mir der Hof 600 Pfund jährlich gibt, so will ich anders—sprechen. So denken vielleicht alle."

Lichtenberg gives here the opinion of an English Whig, but seems to endorse it. He sympathizes with the British, on the other hand, in a humorous poem on the siege of Gibraltar and its defense by Elliot. The Americans,

³³ Ibid. i, 119.

³⁴ Briefwechsel zwischen Christ. Garve und Geo. Joach. Zollikofer, Breslau 1804, p. 252.

³⁵ Vermischte Schriften, Wien 1817, V, 316.

however, are not mentioned in this poem.³⁶ Nettelbeck writes to Bürger (Febr. 7, 1778): "Es ist eine Schande, dass England mit seinen Kolonien sich noch nicht verglichen, da doch diese höchstwichtige Sache so geschwind hat können verglichen werden."³⁷

Hippel, the disciple of Kant, says in his *Kreuz- und Querzüge des Ritters A bis Z*,³⁸ published in 1793-94:

"Wen würdest du in Nordamerika aufsuchen? Franklin und Washington. Und wenn der letztere, so wie der erstere, nicht mehr im Lande der Lebendigen ist, wirst du nicht nach ihren Kindern fragen? Werden dich nicht schon die Namen Washington und Franklin interessieren?"

In another passage in the same work³⁹ Hippel says:

"Der gute Franklin, der seinen Sohn vor Voltaire auf die Knie fallen liess, verglich den Adel mit Tieren, die im Alten Testament ein Greuel sind."⁴⁰

Anton von Klein, Bavarian privy counsellor and literary amateur, wrote a poem *Empfindungen des Doctor Franklin bei einem Blicke in die Natur*. It is largely an adaptation from the English. Klein's friend Professor Eckert, to whom he sent the poem, grew enthusiastic about "the sublime thoughts of the great Franklin."⁴¹

Friedrich Nicolai, the versatile author and book-seller in Berlin, says in his life of Justus Möser:⁴²

"Möser als Schriftsteller ist schon sehr richtig mit Franklin verglichen worden.⁴³ Allerdings findet sich in allen Aufräten beider Schriftsteller 'ein Anstrich von Sonderbarkeit, verbunden mit thätiger, gesunder Vernunft und Menschenliebe.' Bei beiden sind 'Originalität, Eifer zur Verbreitung heilsamer, gemeinnütziger Wahrheiten, Witz und Laune' beinahe in gleich grossem Masse anzutreffen. Indess da Franklins gelehrt und politische Laufbahn

³⁶ Ibid. iv, 237.

³⁷ Strodtmann, *Briefe von und an Bürger*, ii, 229.

³⁸ Leipzig 1860, i, 281.

³⁹ Ibid. i, 119.

⁴⁰ Cf. also ii, 252.

⁴¹ *Litterärisches Leben des Kgl. Bayerischen Geheimen Rates und Ritters Anton von Klein*, Wiesbaden 1818, p. 38 f. The poem appeared in the *Pfälzisches Museum* about 1783.

⁴² Just. Möser, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Abeken, Berlin 1842-3, x, 73.

⁴³ This had been done in an article of the *Berliner Monatsschrift*, July, 1783, p. 37 f.

ganz anders gerichtet war als Möser's, so scheint mir unter den Ausländern niemand als Schriftsteller Mösern näher zu vergleichen wie Addison, der ihm an Fähigkeit zu Geschäften so ganz unähnlich war."

Goethe, too, compares Möser with Franklin. He says in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (bk. 13, end):

"In Absicht auf Wahl gemeinnütziger Gegenstände, auf tiefe Einsicht, freie Uebersicht, glückliche Behandlung, so gründlichen als frohen Humor, wüsste ich ihm (Möser) niemand als Franklin zu vergleichen."

Joh. Georg Zimmermann, the celebrated Swiss physician, says in regard to Franklin:

"Ein vortrefflicher deutscher Schriftsteller hat in einem meisterhaften Aufsatze über Franklins Leben gesagt: Franklins Vortrag habe nie einen Anschein von Gelehrsamkeit, nirgends die Miene eines Compendiums. Alles seien einzelne Bemerkungen mit ihrer ganzen Veranlassung uns angenehm erzählt, kurze Sätze, kleine Abhandlungen, leichte Briefe an Freunde, an Frauenzimmer. Man nehme Teil daran, man ermüde nie, man finde so viel Abwechslung in der Darstellungsart als in den Gegenständen selbst. Dieser feine Geist des Weltmannes, dieser gesunde Natursinn des unpedantischen Weisen lebe und webe überall in Franklins Schriften."

Joh. D. Michaelis, the great orientalist at Göttingen, met Franklin in 1766, and in his autobiography speaks very pleasantly about his American acquaintance. It is to be regretted that Franklin did not keep a diary during his stay at Göttingen, and that no letters of his are extant written during that time.⁴⁵ How generally Franklin was esteemed in Germany may be seen from Lafayette's letter to Franklin dated Paris, February 10, 1786:

"In my tour through Germany I have been asked a thousand questions about you, when I felt equally proud and happy to boast of our affectionate intimacy."⁴⁶

Franklin repeatedly complains in his letters about the numerous applications for appointments in the American army which he receives from all parts of Europe and which he cannot possibly endorse.⁴⁷ It seems that one of the applicants was the poet Pfeffel in Kolmar. In a letter to Sarasin at Basel, he writes that,

⁴⁴ *Ueber die Einsamkeit*, Leipzig 1784, II, 36.

⁴⁵ Cf. John Bigelow, *B. Franklin's Works*, iii, 468.

⁴⁶ Bigelow, I. c. ix, 290.

⁴⁷ Bigelow, I. c. vi, 99 f.

through the good offices of Franklin, he hoped to secure for the poet Klinger a commission in the American army.⁴⁸

The soldier traffic of some of the princes brought the American war close to the hearts of the Germans. It drew forth most bitter protests. Klinger, who has just been mentioned, gives expression to his indignation in several passages of his *Geschichte eines Deutschen der neuesten Zeit* (Leipzig 1798).⁴⁹ Hadem, the broad-minded, big-hearted tutor of a young nobleman, is removed from his position on a trumped-up charge. He enlists as chaplain of a German regiment about to sail for America. Ernst, his pupil, who dearly loved Hadem, goes to Paris to complete his education:

"Franklin war um diese Zeit in Paris. Ernst hatte das Glück, diesem seltenen Manne zu gefallen und von ihm geachtet zu werden. Als sich dieser nun zu seiner Abreise fertig machte, bat ihn Ernst um die Bestellung eines Briefes an Hadem, von dem er den edlen Greis so oft unterhalten hatte. Franklin versprach ihm, wenn Hadem in dem ungeheuren Bezirke von Amerika lebte, so sollte er diesen Brief gewiss bekommen. So viel hatte Ernst schon von Franklin erfahren, dass das Regiment, wobei Hadem stand, in einem für die Engländer und Deutschen unglücklichen Trefen beinahe gänzlich zu Grunde gerichtet worden sei, und man die übrigen als Kriegsgefangene in das Innere des Landes geführt hätte."⁵⁰

In his letter to Hadem, Ernst says:

"Ich war in England, in dem Lande, das die Söhne der Deutschen von ihren Fürsten erkaufte, um sie über das Meer zur Schlachtkbank zu senden. . . . Ich empfinde, was Sie diesen Unglücklichen sein müssen, welche die Goldsucht ihrer Fürsten von dem väterlichen Boden vertrieb, die nun seufzen in der Gefangenschaft im Innern eines fremden Landes, dessen Erde schon den grössten Teil ihrer Brüder in Wildnissen deckt. Ist der Deutsche dazu geboren? Seinen Fürsten von der Natur als eine Waare gegeben? Was hofft dieser von den zurückgebliebenen Waisen, wenn die Zeit kommt, da das Vaterland seiner Söhne bedarf? . . . Ich darf diese Gedanken nicht weiter verfolgen. Kein Volk der Erde verdient mehr Achtung und Schonung von seinen Fürsten, als das deutsche; und dieses Volk

⁴⁸ Erich Schmidt, *Lenz und Klinger*, p. 73; Rieger, *Klinger in der Sturm und Drang Periode*, Darmstadt, 1880, p. 262.

⁴⁹ *Sämtliche Werke*, Cotta 1842, viii, 102 ff.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 125.

wird von ihnen verkauft! Weg mit dem elenden Gedanken, der Deutsche hat kein Vaterland!"

Later (p. 194) Ernst receives a note from Franklin with a letter from Hadem enclosed: "er habe den jungen deutschen Mann auch in Amerika nicht vergessen, seinen Auftrag erfüllt, und sende ihm hiermit einen Beweis davon."

In his letter Hadem relates his experiences in America:

"Aus öffentlichen Nachrichten werden Sie wissen, dass der kleine Überrest des Regiments, bei dem ich angestellt war, in Gefangenschaft geriet. Ich wurde mit fortgeführt, ohne den Sterbenden den letzten Dienst leisten zu können. Was für Elend, was für Jammer habe ich erlebt und angesehen! Und liegt nicht schon alles in dem Gedanken begriffen: die Deutschen wurden für Geld nach Amerika verkauft? Ihre Verkäufer hätten sie sehen sollen, verschmachtend, den Blick nach ihrem Vaterlande, ihren Eltern, Weibern, Kindern, dann zum Himmel, dann auf die fremde Erde richtend, die sich ihnen zum Grabe öffnete!— Ich ward von den Gefangenen getrennt; eine Kolonie Deutscher an den Grenzen der Wilden bemächtigte sich meiner."

Hadem is asked by the Germans in this out-of-the-way settlement to be their minister. They build him a house and treat him with the utmost reverence. When peace is concluded, Hadem wants to return, but his parishioners refuse to let him go. They are so eager to retain him that they resort to trickery: they demand compensation for the expenses they have incurred in maintaining him, "at the same time praying to God to forgive them the wrong they are doing to their minister." Hadem writes to the "noble Franklin," who promises to secure a German minister for the settlement. When Hadem finally returns, he finds Ernst suffering from melancholy. Hoping to arouse his former pupil by threatening to go back to America he says in Ernst's presence (p. 314):

"das verheissene Paradies hier (in Deutschland) habe wirklich abgeblüht; er wolle es nun am Ohio-Strom, in den Wildnissen Amerikas wieder suchen, so alt er auch sei, so sehr er auch der Ruhe bedürfe. Auch habe er mehr Zutrauen, mehr Liebe, Sicherheit und Tugend unter den dortigen Wilden gefunden, als in dem aufgeklärten Europa. . . . Der Europäer verstehe nur schön von der Tugend zu reden. Die Wilden thäten, wovon man hier spräche,

... er sei nun aller europäischen Schwäche, Gleisnerei und Plage herzlich satt."

Hadem's, or rather Klinger's, belief in the moral superiority of the Indian, in the virtue and integrity of the untutored savage, is frequently met with in the writings of that period.⁵¹ It is due to the influence of Rousseau.

Hardly less interesting than the experiences of Hadem are those of Faustin, the hero of a German novel by an anonymous writer in the style of Nicolai's *Sebaldus Nothunker*.⁵² Poor Sebaldus experiences all sorts of troubles and misfortunes at the hands of pietists and orthodox clergymen, whom Nicolai wishes to show up in what he considers their true character. In a similar way, Faustin, a Bavarian rationalist and philanthropist, is made to travel through different parts of Europe for the sole purpose of showing the reader the numerous relics of barbarism, despotism and fanaticism which the age of philosophy and reason has not yet been able to shake off. After several narrow escapes from the fanaticism of the priests, he falls in love with a girl almost at first sight. She takes him to a ball where he drinks too much and falls asleep. As he awakens, he finds himself in the hands of two officers who threaten to shoot him on the spot if he creates any disturbance or tries to run away.⁵³ Faustin enquires of the captain about the way in which he was captured:

"Auf eben die Weise wodurch die meisten Werbungen im H. R. Reich jährlich eine Menge Rekruten erhaschen. Man hält sich in den grossen und kleinen Reichsstädten einige Töchter der Freude, die abgewixt genug sind, junge, hitzige, unvorsichtige Pürschigen an sich zu locken, und sie dann bei einem bequemen Anlass zum Regiment liefern."

Faustin entreats the captain to release him, but the captain roundly refuses; the recruiting officers, he says, have great difficulty to secure the necessary recruits for America.

"Wie Faustin hörte, dass er gar nach Amerika sollt, war er vollends untröstbar. Nach Amerika! rief er schluchzend, nach Amerika! Was geht uns Deutsche Englands Fehde mit seinen Kolonisten an? Finden Sie das unserm

51 Cf. Seume's *Der Kanadier*.

52 *Faustin, oder das philosophische Jahrhundert*, 1780. Dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, 1785, s. l.

53 Cf. Stolberg's *Lied eines deutschen Soldaten in der Fremde*, where a similar scene is described.

menschenfreundlichen, aufgeklärten, philosophischen Jahrhundert angemessen, dass einige deutsche Landesväter ihren Bauern das Geld nehmen; mit eben diesem Gelde die Söhne derselben, den gesündesten, nervigsten Kern der Nation mondieren und armieren, und dann für einige lumpige Guineen an die Britten verkaufen? Ist das etwas anders, als europäischer, noch ärger, etwas anders als deutscher Sklavenhandel?—Man lacht über die Kreuzfahrer, ihre Anführer, und jene europäischen Fürsten, die ihre Untertanen dem Tausend nach in die syrischen Wüsten verschickten, um das elende Palästina mit europäischem Blute zu düngen, oder, wenn's noch gut ging, das Land für einen andern zu erobern; Und diese Phantasten hatten doch gute Aussichten in der Ewigkeit zur Vergeltung, gingen alle aus freiem Willen, und waren aus freiem Willen Narren. Aber nun müssen wir für einige Pfund Sterling uns im Schnee der Huronen wälzen und haben nicht einmal, wie jene, die schmeichelhafte Hoffnung uns ins Paradies zu fechten."

The troops are ordered to proceed to the Weser. Faustin takes comfort in the thought that the trip would give him an opportunity of seeing the English, "the most philosophical of nations," and of getting acquainted with the "philanthropic Quakers at Philadelphia." At Bremerlehe the troops are put aboard two British transports, 'wie Pickelhähinge gepackt.' His impressions of England are not very favorable.

"Unsre philosophischen Herren Britten," he says, "die so viel von Freiheit sprechen, so stolz auf ihre Freiheit sind, und doch bei all dem das grösste Heer Sklaven mit ihrer eisernen Zuchtrute peitschen: Sie haben's verdient, dass sich Nordamerika empörte."

A few days after landing in New York the troops are sent to Jamaica, from there to Pensacola. On the way to Florida they are captured by a Spanish frigate, but later on exchanged for Spanish prisoners. That practically ends Faustin's experience in America.

J. J. Engel, the author of the well-known novel *Herr Lorenz Stark*, satirizes the soldier traffic in his *Fürstenspiegel* (1798).⁵⁴ Princess Kunigunde watches from her window the sad parting of the soldiers bartered away by her father. She is moved to tears. At her next geography lesson she reproaches her tutor for giving her wrong information. He had taught her, she claims, that human beings were sold

⁵⁴ *Schriften*, Berlin, 1802, iii, 154-165.

in Africa only, but now she knew that in Germany, too, human beings were sold for money. She cannot see the difference between the soldier traffic of her father, and the slave trade carried on by

"den afrikanischen Hungerleidern von Prinzen, die um eines geringen nichtswürdigen Gewinnstes willen das Blut ihrer Untertanen an ein fremdes Volk nach einem fremden Weltteil hin verkauften."

Hermes in *Sophiens Reise von Memel nach Sachsen* refers to this traffic with the following bitter words: *Deutschland hat ja Volks genug! wie könnte sonst mit seinem gesündesten Blut die amerikanischen Äcker düngen.*⁵⁵

August Hermann Niemeyer, in a passionate appeal to the German princes not to begin a new war (*An Deutschland, im März 1778*), exclaims:

Hat Albion nicht satt das Schwert geschwungen
Genung der Edlen hingewürgt,
Euer deutsches Blut, zu fremder Freiheitsschlacht gedungen,
Mit Golde sich verbürgt?⁵⁶

Frederick II. expressed his contempt for this traffic at different times.⁵⁷ It is well known that he exacted the same toll for the soldiers that were marched through his dominions bound for America as used to be paid for cattle,⁵⁸ if he did not prohibit their passage altogether. In his *Mémoires depuis la Paix de Hubertsbourg jusqu'à la Paix de Teschen*, he speaks of the German princes bartering away their troops as *des princes avides ou obérés*.⁵⁹ The sale of troops, he fears, will deprive Germany of her natural strength in case of war.⁶⁰

The fate of these poor soldiers deeply affected the general public. That was doubtless one reason why Schubart's *Kaplied* became so popular, though it was not written until 1787, several years after the close of the American war. Matthisson in his *Erinnerungen* (1794) relates⁶¹ that the *Kaplied* was sung from the Limmat in Switzerland to the Baltic Sea, from

⁵⁵ Quoted by A. Henneberger in *Deutsche Litteraturbil- der des 18. Jahrhunderts, Zt. f. deutsche Kulturgeschichte*, 1858, p. 598.

⁵⁶ *Gedichte*, Leipzig 1778, p. 236.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Franklin's Works*, ed. Bigelow, vi, 78 n.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, vii, 78.

⁵⁹ *Oeuvres*, ed. Preuss, vi, 116.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, vi, 118.

⁶¹ *Wien*, 1815, i, 181.

the Moldau in Bohemia to the banks of the Rhine; postilions, journeymen and recruits sang it, as well as officers, students and clerks.

Heinrich Steffens (1773-1845), professor of philosophy at Breslau, relates in his autobiography the impressions the American Revolution made upon him during his childhood.⁶² Though Steffens was a Norwegian by birth, and at the time of the Revolution was living in Denmark, his description doubtless applies also to the German-speaking provinces of Denmark, and to many parts of Germany proper:

"Auch war ich genug von der Bedeutung des nordamerikanischen Krieges unterrichtet, um mit ganzer Seele mich für ein Volk zu interessieren, welches so kühn für seine Freiheit kämpfte. Unter den grossen Männern der damaligen Zeit leuchteten vorzüglich Washington und Franklin hervor. . . . Es waren wohl wenige lebhafte, in dem friedlichen Lande lebende junge Männer, die nicht der Sache der Nordamerikaner anhingen. Die Gesinnung meines Vaters steigerte die Teilnahme der Knaben, ja sie wurde wohl zuerst dadurch veranlasst. Wenn wir die Bedeutung dieses Krieges bedenken, durch welchen zuerst der glimmende Funke nicht allein in Frankreich, sondern in alle Länder der kultivierten Welt hineingeworfen wurde, der später in die mächtige Flamme der Revolution ausschlug, so ist es gewiss nicht ohne Interesse, eine Betrachtung anzustellen, die uns zeigt, wie dieser Funke still genährt wurde in dem ruhigen Schosse der Familien entfernter, friedlicher Länder, und wie die ersten wachgewordenen lebendigen Vorstellungen heranwachsender Kinder das eigene Geschick mit dem zukünftigen von ganz Europa verschmolzen."

When peace was concluded, Steffens' father invited a few friends to celebrate the victory of the Americans:

"Die Sache der Freiheit der Völker ward lebhaft besprochen, und es war wohl eine Ahnung von den grossen Ereignissen, die aus diesem Siege hervorgehen sollten, die damals der Seele der Jubelnden vorschwebte. Es war die freundliche Morgenröte des blutigen Tages der Geschichte."

JOHN A. WALZ.

Western Reserve University.

THE 'LUZINDA' OF LOPE DE VEGA'S SONNETS.

AN inordinate weakness for the female sex was a characteristic of Lope de Vega from his

⁶² *Was ich erlebte*. Breslau, 1840, i, 77-81.

early youth till the very close of his long career. In his *Dorotea*, written early in life—between 1587 and 1590—but revised and printed by Lope when he was seventy years old, he relates unblushingly and evidently with no little satisfaction, events of which he ought to have felt ashamed. And though Lope was twice married, he never allowed this fact at any time to interfere with his love affairs, nor did his joining the priesthood after the death of his second wife, turn him from his former ways; in fact he had established his last love Doña María de Nevares Santoyo—in his own house in the Calle de Francos, where she died in 1632, three years before Lope's death.

From documents that have lately been published, and notably those by the well-known scholar, Pérez Pastor in the *Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo*, Lope's conduct during his first courtship in no wise redounds to his credit. There is every reason to believe that in order to insure his obtaining the hand of Doña Isabel de Urbina y Cortinas, the young lady who was in love with him, he abducted her, and so secured the consent of her family, which had been denied him on account of his unenviable reputation in Madrid. This was, we now know, in 1588. Doña Isabel died, in all probability, in 1595 at Alba de Tormes.

Three years after this, in 1598, Lope married at Madrid, Doña Juana de Guardo, who brought him a considerable dowry. She died in 1613, a few days after giving birth to Lope's daughter Feliciana. Perhaps even prior to his first marriage Lope had been a writer for the Madrid stage—the exact date is not known. He tells us he wrote plays at the age of thirteen, but the earliest dated play we have is of 1539. This contact with the theatrical profession of his time was disastrous to his very impressionable nature, as the record of his life shows. "Love was in Lope Felix de Vega Carpio," as his learned biographer, Barrera, says, "the most imperious necessity, the vivifying sun of that prodigiously fertile imagination."¹ By this, however, his biographer means "love" for anybody else except his own wife.

Among the many loves that Lope had in the course of a long and by no means platonic career, there was one whose identity, so far

¹ *Nueva Biografía*, p. 86.

as I know, has never been fully established. It is the 'Luzinda,' sometimes called 'Camila Luzinda,' of Lope's poems.

The earliest mention of Luzinda occurs in the *Segunda Parte de las Rimas*, published at Madrid in 1602, in the same volume with the *Hermosura de Angélica*, and the reprint of the *Dragontea*, which had already appeared in 1598. The *Hermosura de Angélica* had been written as early as 1588; when the verses to Luzinda were written, it is impossible to say, —they probably extended over a period of several years prior to 1602, as early perhaps as 1596 or 1595, the year of the death of Doña Isabel de Urbina. Lope's solemn asseveration in a poem *Lope de Vega á Lucinda*, prefixed to the *Hermosura de Angélica*:

"Pues nunca me ayude Dios
Sino he sacado de vos
Quanto de Angélica dijo"

is apparently not true, if we believe his statement that he wrote the work in 1588, during the expedition of the Armada.

Among the two hundred sonnets in the *Segunda Parte de las Rimas* there are twenty-two written to Lucinda, three of which, at least, are extremely beautiful, and all are written with that grace and ease which Lope's verse always shows. Among the other verses written to Lucinda is an *Epístola*, inserted in his *Peregrino en su Patria*, a work finished in 1602, and which was published in the following year. This *epístola* is certainly one of the most beautiful poems that ever flowed from Lope's pen. We shall quote only that part of it which is of present interest. Lope deplores his absence from Toledo, where Lucinda lives, in these verses:

Ya pues que el alma y la ciudad dexava,
Y no se oya del famoso río
El claro son con que sus muros laua,
A Dios dixe mil veces, dueño mio,
Hasta que a verme en tu ríbera vuelua,
De quien tan tiernamente me desuio.
No suele el Ruysefior en verde selua
Llorar el nicto de uno en otro ramo
De florido arrayan y madreselua,
Con mas doliente voz que yo te llamo
Ausente de mis dulces paxarillos,
Por quien en llanto el coraçon derramo.
Ni brama, si le quitan sus nouillos,
Con mas dolor la vaca, atrauesando
Los campos de agostados amarillos,
Ni con arrullo mas lloroso y blando

La Tórtola se quexa, prenda mia,
Que yo me estoy de mi dolor quexando.
Lucinda, sin tu dulce compañia,
Y sin las prendas de tu hermoso pecho,
Todo es llorar desde la noche al dia.
Que con solo pensar que està derecho
Mi nido ausente, me atrauesa el alma,
Dando mil unctions a mi cuello estrecho."²

It follows from these verses that the fruit of this love-affair with Lucinda was two children —*dulces, paxarillos*, sweet little birds, Lope calls them. From his *Epístola* to his friend Gaspar de Barrionuevo, we learn their names —Mariana and Angelilla:

"Mariana y Angelilla mil manzanas
Se acuerda de Hametillo, que a la tienda
Las llevaba por chochos y avellanas;
Y Lucinda os suplica no se venda
Sin que primero la aviseis del precio."³

In the same *Segunda Parte de las Rimas*, and therefore written before October 20, 1602 —the date of the *Privilegio*, occurs the following sonnet:

A dos niñas.

Para tomar de mi desden vengança,
Quítome Amor las niñas que tenía,
Con que mira yo como solia,
Todas las cosas en yqual templança.
A lo menos conozco la mudanza
En los antojos de la vista mia,
De un dia en otro no descanso un dia,
Del tiempo huye lo que el tiempo alcança.
Almos parecen de mis niñas puestas
En mis ojos que bafia tierao llanto,
O niñas, nifio amor, nifios antojos.
Niño deseo que el vivir me cuestas,
Mas que mucho tambien que llore tanto
Quien tiene quatro niñas en los ojos."⁴

This sonnet must refer to Lucinda's two children mentioned above; namely, Mariana and Angelilla, and the *Epístola* to Lucinda must have been written prior to 1602, and afterwards inserted in the *Peregrino en su Patria*. This same Lucinda bore Lope another daughter, Marcela, in 1605, and a son, Lope Felix, in 1607.

Who was really the lady hidden beneath this poetical pseudonym, is a question asked by Barrera. He inclines to the belief that it is Marfa de Lujan—who, it was well known, was the mother of Lope's children Marcela

² Ed. Brussels, 1608, pp. 286-7.

³ *Obras Suetas*, Vol. iv, p. 388.

⁴ Ed. of 1602, p. 259.

and Lope Felix. Barrera's surmise was entirely correct, only he was unable to prove it, though he really had the proof at hand and gives it in his *Life of Lope*, only in some unaccountable way he overlooked it.

In the first place it never was certain that the lady's name was *Maria de Lujan*. That name, as it turns out, was first given by Alvárez y Baena, in his *Hijos de Madrid*, but Barrera shows that he is not an entirely trustworthy authority. Now, however, since Pérez Pastor published his *Datos acerca de Lope de Vega*,⁵ all doubt has been removed. In *Documento num. 7*, we read:

"En la iglesia parrochial de San Sebastian de la villa de Madrid, en siete de Febrero de mil y seiscientos y siete años, yo, Alonso del Arco, baticé un niño (*nacido*?) en veinte y ocho de Enero del dicho año, hijo de Lope de Vega Carpio y de Micaela de Lujan, y le pusieron por nombre Lope, y fueron sus padrinos D. Hurtado de Mendoza y Hieronima de Burgos."

The name is therefore not 'Maria de Lujan,' but 'Micaela de Lujan' or Luxan, and an almost perfect anagram is 'Camila Luzinda.'

One of the sponsors is Hierónima de Burgos, a famous actress of the time and also an intimate friend of Lope's. Micaela de Luxan was therefore, also, in all probability an actress, and this conjecture is made certain by a statement of Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa in his *Plaza Universal*, written in 1610-11, and first published in 1615. I quote from the edition of Perpignan, 1630 (p. 336). Here among the most famous actresses then living he mentions:

"Juana de Villalua, Mariflores, Michaela de Luzan, Ana Muños, Jusepa Vaca, Gerónima de Burgos, Polonia Pérez, María de los Ángeles and María de Morales."

I have searched in vain, however, in such books as are at my command, for any further notice of Micaela de Luxan. She is not mentioned in Cassiano Pellicer, *Tratado Histórico sobre el Origen y Progresos de la Comedia y del Histrionismo en España*, Madrid, 1804; nor does Gallardo give the name in his list of *Comediantes*. From the fact that Suárez de Figueroa mentions Micaela de Luxan as living in 1610, it does not follow, of course, that she was also still acting. I am rather of the opinion that her stage career was confined to

⁵ *Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo*, Vol. i, p. 595.

the last decade of the sixteenth, and the first years of the seventeenth century. Unfortunately such lists of players as are found in books accessible to me are generally of a later date—after 1615, and mostly after 1625.

Of the lists given in MSS. of Lope's plays, the earliest that I have been able to consult are of the year 1610; they are *La hermosa Ester* and *La Encomienda bien guardada*, in neither of which do we find the name Micaela de Luxan. An examination, however, of some of the earlier MSS. of Lope, of which at least five are known prior to 1598, would probably reveal the name.

How long this love affair with Micaela de Luxan lasted we do not know. After the death of Lope's second wife, Doña Juana, in 1613, he took his two children, Marcela and Lope Felix, into his own care. Where they had been prior to this time is a matter of conjecture. Did they continue to be in the care of their mother, Lucinda? It would be interesting to know. Certain it is, however, that by the close of the year 1615 Lope is on with a new love—Doña María de Nevares Santoyo, the *Amarilis* of his later verses.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.
University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

An Old English Martyrology. Re-edited from manuscripts in the libraries of the British Museum, and of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with introduction and notes by GEORGE HERZFIELD, Ph.D. London: Published for the E. E. T. S. by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1900. xlii+243 pp.

THIS is in some respects one of the most important of recent Old English reprints. In the first place, one of the manuscripts upon which the text is based, though only a fragment, belongs among the oldest manuscripts of English literature. Secondly, the Martyrology is one of the most extensive monuments of Old English prose that has appeared during the last few years, and the text is in itself doubly interesting because it appears to have been, in its earliest form, of Anglian or Mercian origin. Finally, Herzberg's book is important

because the text was previously inaccessible to most students of Old English literature, for Cockayne's edition¹ has long been out of print.

Herzberg has, generally speaking, done his work well, especially the Introduction, which embraces forty-three pages, and treats of the origin and growth of Martyrologies in the early Christian church, the genealogy of the several manuscripts, the date of the oldest text, the locality where it originated, and the sources of the Old English Martyrology. The text and a parallel modern English translation embrace two hundred and twenty-three of the two hundred and forty-three pages of the book, the remaining twenty pages being devoted to Notes and Corrigenda, and an alphabetical list of the saints whose names occur in the Martyrology.

From the Introduction we learn that Martyrologies are legal descendants of the early church calendars and Legendaria. Some of the less important ones date back to the third and fourth centuries, but the most important of the early martyrologies for the Western Church dates from the time of St. Jerome, to whom it was long incorrectly attributed. From this pseudo-Jerome, the lesser Roman Martyrology (*Martyrologium Romanum parvum*, discovered by Ado, Archbishop of Vienne, at Ravenna in 850), and the work of Bede and Florus, all later Books of Martyrs have been derived. Such collections, the editor thinks, were intended to refresh the memory of the monastic preacher, and to supply him with the ground-work of his sermons.

Four manuscripts of the Old English Martyrology have come down to us, all incomplete. Two of these, A and D, are mere fragments, while B and C are more extensive and complete. While A (Brit. Mus., Addit. 23211) is a bare fragment covering one small leaf, it is nevertheless very valuable because of its antiquity (it is attributed to the latter half of the ninth century), and its Mercian dialect. And D (Corp. Christ. Coll., Cambr., No. 41), though a late West Saxon manuscript, is almost equally valuable, since it is the only one which contains the entries from December 25 to 31 (pp. 1 to 10 of the text). This man-

¹ In *The Shrine* (1864-73).

script is the well known Parker MS. of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. Miller, in the Introduction of his edition of the Old English version of Bede, places the date of D "at about the time of the Conquest," but Herzberg thinks "we may put it down as belonging to the end of the eleventh century as the earliest date." The text of this manuscript also shows undoubtedly Mercian influence.

Of the two longer manuscripts B (Brit. Mus., Cod. Cotton, Julius A x) and C (Corp. Christ. Coll. Cambr., No. 196) the editor considers the former the better and more reliable, and therefore makes it the basis of his text. B

"is a West Saxon transcript of a Mercian manuscript, as is shown by the numerous Mercian forms occurring in it; at the same time the prevailing influence of the West Saxon dialect is undeniable."

C, though "apparently somewhat earlier than B,"² contains more mistakes in the form of omissions and interpolations. It seems to have "been written about the beginning of the tenth century," and differs from B in showing a much smaller proportion of Mercian forms; but C contains "many traces of late West Saxon and even a few of the Kentish dialect." It is the only manuscript that contains the latter part of the text (p. 204, 4 to end).

Herzberg shows by careful investigation that B follows A very closely, and he is led to believe that both manuscripts go back to the same original:

"The scribe of A may have possibly had the archetype before him. As to B, which is a much later copy, it is reasonable to assume that there must have been a link between it and C, because it shows a number of mistakes of its own. Besides it is pretty sure that C must be derived from the same source as B, as they have certain mistakes in common."³

In regard to the date of the Martyrology Cockayne says in a note at the end of his text:⁴

"We must conclude that this Martyrology is of the age of Alfred; none of its materials are

² I am inclined to think Herzberg wrong in saying this manuscript was "apparently written in the second half of the tenth century." It is written in a distinct eleventh century hand, characteristic of the period just before the Conquest.

³ See pp. xi-xiii.

⁴ *The Shrine*, p. 157. Cf. pp. 45, 124, 148.

more recent; it is further directly indebted to that king himself, and doubtless composed under his direction; it draws from Benedictine, Roman, English and Syriac sources."

Herzberg shows that Cockayne's statements are for the most part unfounded. While the existence of a fragment (MS. A) from the latter part of the ninth century would seem to prove that the *Book of Martyrs* is as old as King Alfred, "there is not the vestige of a proof" that he had anything to do with its composition. The text, in its original form, seems upon quite trustworthy evidence to have been composed in a Mercian monastery, and the Mercian district "never formed a part of King Alfred's dominion." Moreover, the presumption is very strong

"that the book was composed merely for the use of the monks in their services, and the King cannot be expected to have meddled with a matter of monastic discipline."

The last point does not seem to be well taken, when we remember that King Alfred concerned himself zealously with the spiritual affairs of his kingdom; and we may be sure from what we know of his character that he would not have hesitated to meddle with monastic discipline, had he considered it necessary, or of great importance to his people.

To what extent certain legends recorded in the Martyrology are derived directly from oriental sources, it is difficult to say. Cockayne holds⁵ that the legends of St. Mylas and Sennus (Nov. 15), for example,

"must have reached our English bishop direct from Syria, probably from Helias, patriarch of Jerusalem, with whom a correspondence of King Alfred is expressly recorded in the nearly contemporary 'Leech book.'"

Herzberg has shown that the materials might easily have come into England through other channels. Before the time of Alfred the Great "Englishmen had plenty of opportunities for acquiring knowledge of Oriental legends. A perpetual intercourse between English and French monasteries had been going on from an early period. In France the appearance of Oriental monks was by no means infrequent."⁶ Still, if King Alfred was in correspondence with the patriarch of Jerusalem, as Cockayne states, at a time when there existed "a passion

⁵ *The Shrine*, p. 148.

⁶ P. xxxix; Cf. pp. 178 and 200.

for investigation into ritual and ecclesiastical antiquity generally," there is no reason why he should not have received the legends direct from Jerusalem.

Herzberg seems to be clearly in the right in claiming a Mercian origin for the text of the Martyrology, and there is no apparent objection to his suggestion of "Lincolnshire as the place where it was composed." It is interesting to learn in this connection "that very few South English martyrs have found their way into the list of saints," in fact only three; while "all the other English saints belong to the Mercian or Northumbrian provinces." A few noteworthy omissions from the list of Martyrs, like that of St. Boniface, would also seem to be against a West Saxon origin of the Martyrology.

Judging from grammatical peculiarities the editor thinks

"the Martyrology can not possibly be later than 900. We might even fix its date as early as 850, if we are allowed to draw any conclusions from the syntax."

In his investigations of the sources, Herzberg has succeeded in finding originals for almost all the legends and anecdotes recorded in the Martyrology. The researches of Cockayne in this direction rendered the task much less difficult, and the importance of his work receives just acknowledgment. Of about two hundred and thirty different legends, events, and anecdotes mentioned in the book, there are only twenty for which no originals have yet been discovered.

The attempt to show the indirect influence of the Talmudic writings upon the account of the creation (March 19-23) is interesting, but the evidence produced is not entirely convincing.⁷ The source of the 'Harrowing of Hell' incident (March 26)⁸ is certainly not biblical, unless we consider the bible in a very loose, indefinite sense as the source of such mediaeval treatises as the *Gesta Pilati*, and especially of the second part of the "Pseudo-Gospel of Nicodemus." The contents of this interesting entry show that the source was most likely the second part of the *Evangelii Nicodemii*, otherwise entitled⁹ *Descensus Christi*

⁷ See pp. xxxv and 226-7. ⁸ Cf. pp. xxxviii and 30.

⁹ Cf. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 368 ff.

ad Inferos. The presence of this description in the Martyrology bears further testimony¹⁰ to the popularity of the "Harrowing" episode in Old English literature.

The compiler of the Old English text has on the whole followed the Latin original very closely:

"He does not give much more than a mere outline of the legends, and sometimes not even so much; in a few cases, however, he enlarges on a story which seems to have struck his fancy as being peculiar and out of the way."¹¹

Herzberg does not seem to me to have been so happy in building up his text from the somewhat confusing materials of the several manuscripts, as in the disposal of literary-historical questions of sources, date or origin, etc. He has, to be sure, given us a clear and generally reliable text, that is, from his point of view. Objection, however, might be raised to his method of procedure, and it may be that the editor was not altogether responsible for this. Where two manuscripts of a text present so many orthographical and syntactical differences as do B and C, it would certainly be more desirable to print the two parallel, as the marginal notes would otherwise assume undue proportions. Since this plan was not adopted, doubtless for valid reasons, we have a right to expect that the foot-notes shall be carefully and orderly arranged, and shall contain sufficient hints and materials to enable the student to restore the original reading of any one of the manuscripts. In this respect Herzberg's notes are frequently very deficient. It would be impossible for one to gain more than a faint conception of the orthography of C, for instance, from the help given in the marginal notes, beginning with page 40. And the additional materials and suggestions of the Introduction and Addenda do not improve the confusion which such an arrangement as Herzberg's is sure to produce. If a few hints had been given in the foot-notes, such as that the form *twentigoðan* always occurs in C, and that *ys*, *hig*, *ylcan*, *sylf(e)*, *worulde*, etc., are regular forms of C, the editor could have avoided repeating "twentigoðan, etc., C" for

¹⁰ Cf. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xiii, 462-3.

¹¹ See p. xxxvi.

dozens of times. Moreover, whenever a form is given in the notes as occurring in C, he should have been careful to give the exact reading of C, and not that of B, or his own normalized forms. For example, the reading of C 40, 11 (note) is *myd pe beon*, not *mid*, etc.; 42, 10 (note) *se hyt* (not *hit*); 42, 11 *ðe ðær æt hym* not *him*; 42, 23 *syðon* not *siðon*, etc. Such slips are not sufficiently excused by the statement made in the Introduction¹² that *y* continually occurs for *i* in manuscript C. In fact, there are several instances in which C has *i*, and B, *y*, although the *y* forms in C are the rule.

Of course, every one who has had experience in editing texts from several different manuscripts will appreciate the difficulties which Herzberg met with in attempting to give only a partial list of the variants in a correct form. The strongest objections to the plan he pursued are that he seems to have had no method in noting different readings, and his text is not sufficient for purposes of careful scholarship. The following are the *errata* which I noticed in making a careful comparison of Herzberg's text (pp. 40-70)¹³ with my own collation of manuscript C. From the beginning to page 40 the editor had comparatively easy sailing, as he generally had only one manuscript to deal with. In these first forty pages (that is, twenty pages of text) there are several minor mistakes, such as failure to indicate the manuscript abbreviations for *m*, *n*, and *er*, but I have noticed no serious errors. It is with page 40 that manuscript C begins, and from this point on mistakes, misprints, and omissions, for the most part in the marginal notes, are very frequent.

41, 11, (note) *myd pe beon* C; *penden] pa hwile* C; 21, *fylledfod* C. 42, 3, *untrūmyssa* C; 5, *sumere* C; 6, *dæg, undernreste* C; 9, 7 *se hyra pegen wæs* C; 10, *pa sealde se hyt pam* C; 11, *ondranc* (?) B; 12, *hig, þ hyt* C; 14, *hig* C; 19, *gesingodon* C; 22, *mennisc* C; 23, *singiað syðon* C; 25, *wanað* C; 27, *symle* C; 28, *ponne he byð beforan hyre ponne wanað hys leoht* C (after *leoht* of text;—this sentence escaped Herzberg entirely). 44, 2, *symle* C; 4, *bene-*

¹² P. xiii.

¹³ I did not have time to complete the collation of the MS. when last in Cambridge.

dictus C; 5, abbudes C; 7, syllan C; 8, forðam C; 10, swa C; 24, on þam . . . gesceop C; 25, woruldsnottere C. 46, 5, feldam C; 8, fenne C; 10, þa dage C; 11, seo was gesceopen C; 12, wylddeor C; 13, myhton C; 14, geheoldon C; 15, mennisce C; 17, feor C; 22, prowode C. 50, 6, eond C; 8, B omits ealle; 14, nu om. C, myd pynū C; 23, seofen C; 26, beobread C] bebread (?) B. 52, 6, hyt byð medemū men C; 12, daeg byð þ ylce C; 13, on pone C. 54, 2, sisninius, chionian C; 5, hrægel C; 13, wið strangre peode (mid of text misprint!); 14, þa ætywde C; 18, swylce hylle C; 20, 7 þa sona C; 27, ðæssalonica B; 27, swustra C] swoestra (?) B. 56, 2, 1 þæra nama C; 3, sorotina C; 7, hys nama wæs on ledan, minus C; 11, þæs om. C; 21, fyðera C. 58, 1, byð þæs C; 2, sē om. C, anthie, 7 C; 7, on þ scryð C; 13, up C; 14, 7 þa het C. 60, 1, 7 þa, hyne, forhwan C; fregn (?) B; 2, hu myhte butu samod C; 4, georius C; 5, seofan (?) B, seofen C; 10, pe myd hym ær, tyntregodon C; 16, frecnese (?) B, frecednyses C; 17, stefen C; 21, ongytan C (not "B" as Herzberg notes); 26, wylferðes C, gewytennys C] geleornes B (Herzberg repeats this note several times). 62, 5, 7 onsundru C; 13, milcelra (?) B] mycelra C; 14, heom forgiſe C; 15, smyltlice C. 64, 1, æfestegodon C; 6, on æfenne C; 10, myd pig rape C; 19, cwæð he wā om. C; 23, hi preagean] preatian hig C; 24, myd þam hig ne myhte C; 27, up dryhten myn C. 66, 1, tyd 7 ðrowung C; 2, pynne C; 11, hym syllan C; 12, siððan om. C; 13, wundru C; 15, in þa ceastr C; 16, ys gehaten C; 19, morgestorra C; 25, myd C. 68, 4, myd . . . myhte C; 6, hyne C; 7, awyht C; 8, ofer hig ne come C; 9, oðra C; 10, seo om. C; 17, ceaster C; 24, brytene C; 25, on daeg C; 26, philippus C. 70, 4, ys ponne C; 8, dohtor C; 15, werod C; 26, 1 þa het þæne pap-an C. 72, 6, þe hatte nu . . . ia (numentana) C; 13, byrgenne 7 hys lych. C; 21, þæm om. crystene C; 24, þ ys C, not omitted as Herzberg states.¹⁴

Herzberg's translation is not all that could be wished, but he generally succeeds in reproducing the meaning of the original in lan-

¹⁴ In the preceding list I have noted especially errors in Herzberg's marginal notes, and words or phrases omitted from or added in C which he has not given. Of course, no attempt has been made to enumerate the scores of variant readings in C, which he apparently omitted purposely.

guage which, though frequently crude and teeming with German idioms, is capable of being understood. Here as in the case of the text, one is at sea as to his method: one never knows whether he is trying to reproduce the original literally in modern English, or whether he is seeking a comparatively free translation. He has himself not told us any where what he is aiming at. His punctuation is about as bad as it could well be, and it is made the more so by the constant omission in the translation of the old English particles *ond*, *þa*, etc. There are accepted English forms of the names *Datianus*, *Diocletianus*, *Adrianus*, *Urbanus*, etc., but Herzberg does not use them.

In conclusion I cannot refrain from expressing the wish that the E.E.T.S. had embraced a good glossary in its plan of such publications, and left the translation to each individual student. Such publications as the present one, at least, appeal almost entirely to the limited world of English scholars and students to whom even a good translation is superfluous, but who would cherish a carefully made glossary. A glossary of such a little known text would also be a valuable contribution to English lexicography.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

GOETHE.

Goethe über seine Dichtungen. Versuch einer Sammlung aller Aeußerungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke von HANS GRAEF. Erster Theil: Die epischen Dichtungen: Erster Band. Frankfurt: Rütten und Loening, 1901. 8vo, xxiii+492 pp.

GRAEF aims to give all the utterances of Goethe concerning his poetic works with only the exception of his translations from foreign languages. He has divided his material into three parts, of which the first brings Goethe's utterances concerning his epic works in prose or verse, the second those about his dramatic works, and the third those regarding his lyric poems. Each of these three parts is to form a complete whole in itself, with separate pagination and separate full indexes; for convenience's sake, however, parts one and two are to be published in two volumes each.

Dr. Gräf was until last February connected with the library of Wolfenbüttel, which Lessing superintended for so long, and now has taken charge of the Public Library of Freiburg im Breisgau. He is one of the editors of the great Weimar edition of Goethe's works and, besides, has made himself favorably known as a Goethe scholar by his edition of *Briefe von Heinrich Voss über Goethe und Schiller*, which appeared in 1896. The more he occupied himself with Goethe, the more he realized that a full and sure understanding of his works is impossible without as complete an insight as possible into their genesis, and that the utterances of the poet himself upon his works are their safest commentary. While, with a similar persuasion, Pniower collected and published all the testimonies referring to Faust, Gräf undertook the gigantic task of gathering Goethe's utterances on all of his poetic works, and though conscious of the fact that some further information may come to light with the diaries and letters of Goethe which still remain unedited, he commenced the publication of his material at the beginning of the present year, in order that Goethe students might not continue to be without so valuable an aid for an indefinite period to come.

Volume one, which contains the utterances on twenty-two epic works, opens with a general preface in which the author explains his enterprise and defends his line of proceeding, a bibliography of the works which are most frequently cited, and two tables of the epic works according to their chronology and poetic form respectively. The twenty-two works themselves are arranged in alphabetical order, *Hermann und Dorothea* and *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* occupying one fourth of the entire volume each, and *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderter*, *Achilleis*, *Reineke Fuchs* and *Novelle* coming next in space. Under each head, first a list of the existing manuscripts and the prints supervised by the poet himself and the editors of his 'Nachlass' is given; then follow the utterances themselves in strictly chronological order, accompanied by copious cross-references and explanations. The most valuable part of the latter is that consisting of extracts from the letters of the correspondents to which Goethe refers in his own letters.

Gräf's work is intended both for the special philological student of Goethe and for the cultured lover of his works, and while it may be pronounced indispensable to the former, it will very much enhance the pleasure and profit of the latter. For what greater delight can there be to the lover of literature than to be guided in his enthusiasm for a great work of poetry by the poet's own hand!

It is to be hoped that Part I will be complete before very long, and that the next may follow in as rapid succession as possible. For the present the author deserves our gratitude both for what he has done and for the manner in which he has accomplished it.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

On Southern Poetry Prior to 1860. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the University of Virginia as a part of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By SIDNEY ERNEST BRADSHAW, June, 1900, pp. 162.

PROF. BRADSHAW's dissertation is the first of a series of "Studies in Southern Literature" promised by the English department of the University of Virginia. The theme of this first number is the poetry of the South before 1860; the purpose of the study, to collect and systematize material concerning the Southern verse and verse-writers of that period. The book then is, in large part, as the author frankly admits, a compilation, containing some critical material, but consisting in the main of biographical and bibliographical data. It is accordingly of chief value as a book of reference.

The author deals with his subjects by centuries. Within these larger divisions he takes up each of the poets separately, considering them in the order of their first appearance in print—a plan which has been too closely followed in some instances. Wilde, for instance, whose dates are 1789-1847, and whose best-known poem was written before 1815, comes immediately after Deems, who was born in 1820, and just before Requier, whose dates are 1825-1887.

The proportion observed in these sketches is also open to criticism; though such criticism

is forestalled by the author's disavowal (p. 38) of any pretensions to observe that principle. Still such a disclaimer should not shield from criticism the writer who would give to Simms as a poet nine pages, to Munford five pages, or to O'Hara four pages, while Pike and P. P. Cooke are dismissed with two pages each. And in the case of Poe—who receives but three pages—while one may excuse meagreness of critical and biographical detail, he cannot but feel that a biography of the most important and more recent references should have been given.

Certain errors of judgment or of statement are also to be noted. Captain Smith's poem (p. 21) should not be classed with the poetry of the South, inasmuch as Smith left Virginia in 1609, never to return again, while his poem is usually dated about 1630. And a slight modification should be made in the statement on page 94, to the effect that Cooke's *Froissart Ballads* were "based on the stories of the old French chronicler;" most of the ballads were indeed based on Froissart, but some of them—notably *The Master of Ballantrae* and *Geoffrey Tetenoire*, the first two—as Cooke tells us in a prefatory note, were inventions of his own in the style of those based on Froissart.

But perhaps the chief limitation of the study is to be found in the incompleteness of its bibliographical lists. These lists, though as a rule full, do not include a number of magazine articles embodying the results of more recent and original research. Among the most important of these are the late Professor Ross's valuable articles on Timrod (*Quarterly Review of the M. E. Church South*, xiii, 239-261, 1893), Pinkney (*Sewanee Review*, iv, 287-297, 1896), and Meek (*Sewanee Review*, iv, 410-427, 1896). Other additions to be made to the bibliographical data are as follows:—under Cook¹ (p. 29): Steiner, *Publications of the Md. Hist. Socy.*, No. 36, pp. 102, 1900 (a reprint of the *Sotweed Factor*, with other early Maryland poems); under Tucker (p. 35): *Magazine of American Hist.*, vii, 45-46, 1881, and *Southern Literary Messenger*, ii, 469 f., 739, 1836; under Dabney (p. 43): *So. Lit. Mess.*, ix, 329 f., 390,

¹ The author should not perhaps be held accountable for omitting reference to the works I cite under Cook and Pike, since they probably appeared after his work had gone to the printers.

408 f., 557 f., 1848; under Allston (p. 46): the standard life of Allston, by Flagg, Scribner's, 1892; under Key (p. 48): *Century*, xxvi, 358 f., 1894; under Pike¹ (p. 69): the collective edition of Pike's poems, edited and published by Allsopp, Little Rock, Ark., 1900; under Wilde (p. 83): C. C. Jones, Jr., *Life, Literary Labors, and Neglected Grave of Wilde*, (no date), and certain articles on the authorship of Wilde's famous song, in *So. Lit. Mess.*, i, 252, 452, 1835, xxiii, 249, 1856; under Cooke (p. 95): *So. Lit. Mess.*, xxvi, 419-432, 1858, xvi, 125, 1850, xvii, 669 f., 701, 1851; and under Timrod (p. 129): Austin, *International Review*, ix, 310-319, 1880.

But to recognize in these omissions the chief limitation of the book constitutes, in reality, an admission that it has few or no serious limitations. Indeed, considering the difficulties under which Professor Bradshaw labored, he has done his work well. He need have little fear that his book, bringing together, as it does, in convenient form, a mass of information heretofore to be had only after much plodding—and to many largely inaccessible—will not prove both useful and interesting to the sympathetic student of the history of our literature.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

University of Texas.

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.

Schiller's Wallenstein. Edited with introduction, notes, and map, by MAX WINKLER, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901. 8vo, lxxvi+446 pp.

THIS welcome addition to the well-known Macmillan series presents itself as an attractive volume of surprisingly small compass if we consider the fullness of introductory matter and notes, and the unusual length of the text. The evident desire to reduce the bulk of the book has led to the adoption of type that is rather too small to be desirable in textbooks. It must be admitted, however, that the press work is of such excellency as to make the page, despite the small and crowded type, appear lucid and attractive.

Prof. Winkler's edition is evidently the result of conscientious scholarly labor, and al-

though Dr. Breul's exhaustive treatment of the drama must have materially lightened the work of the later editor, his work bears in every detail the impress of independent investigation, and plainly rests on wide reading in the historical literature on the subject.

The linguistic and historical interpretation of Wallenstein, though it calls for an extensive commentary, offers but few real difficulties and leaves but little room for differences of opinion. But some of the broader literary aspects of the drama continue to be veritable bones of contention among the most competent critics and commentators. On such questions, it is, therefore, permissible to differ considerably from the position taken by the editor without, thereby, in the least impugning the carefulness of his work or the soundness of his judgment. The present writer's views on most of these mooted topics are unfortunately not in accord with those held by Prof. Winkler, but no attempt shall be made to enter into their discussion, except in so far as the editor's general view on these matters has induced him to put on a few isolated passages a construction that does not seem warranted by the facts in the case.

Prof. Winkler's thoughtful *Introduction* is well written, and, despite its length, by no means prolix. It observes a fair balance between solid information and critical and literary suggestions, and seems slightly wanting only in warmth and personality of tone and treatment, and that, perhaps, purposely. For advanced college students it can hardly be said to contain much that is not desirable or, at any rate, useful. In fact, we regret the absence of a brief chapter on the general position of the drama in German literature.

Only the long first chapter on the historical Wallenstein seems to furnish considerably more information than is needed by the student of the *drama*, for the critical results of modern historical investigation cannot throw any light on the drama as such. More important, from a literary point of view, is a clear conception of Wallenstein as Schiller found him in his sources, which are far less accessible than the modern historical treatises. If, therefore, a wish might be expressed in regard to this chapter, which in itself is well done

and full of interest, we should prefer a briefer treatment of the Wallenstein of modern historical research, complemented by a fuller comparative treatment of the Wallenstein of Schiller's sources and of his *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Kriegs*.

The second chapter of the introduction carefully traces the genesis of the drama at the hand of numerous illustrative references to Schiller's important correspondence on this subject, especially with Goethe and Körner. Some of these quotations incidentally open up the question of the place of fate in the economy of the play, a question which later is more fully discussed in the chapter dealing with the character of the Wallenstein of the drama. On one of these quotations I beg to offer a few remarks.

The word *Schicksal* in the passage from the letter of November 28, 1796 (p. xlvi), as well as *Gestirne* in the famous lines 109-110 of the prologue, the editor interprets as "his fate in general, which is a necessary expression of his character." In both instances such an interpretation seems to do violence to the natural meaning of language and the logical cogency of thought. In the letter to Goethe, Schiller plainly has in mind the irreconcilable contrast between the historical facts of the Wallenstein story as he found it in his authorities, and his own convictions of what constitutes *Vergnügen am Tragischen*, as he had outlined them in 1792 in *Über die tragische Kunst*. These convictions can be plainly outlined by quoting a few passages from this important essay, to which, as to some others of the *Ästhetische Schriften*, Prof. Winkler makes rather too brief reference (p. xxxix).

"Diejenige Kunst, . . . welche sich das *Vergnügen des Mitleids* ins besondere zum Zweck setzt, heisst *die tragische Kunst*."¹—"Die tragische Kunst wird also die Natur in denjenigen Handlungen nachahmen, welche den mitleidigen Affekt *vorzüglich* zu erwecken vermögen."—"Wenn die *Unlust über die Ursache eines Unglücks zu stark* wird, so schwächt sie unser *Mitleid* mit demjenigen, der es erleidet."—"So schwächt es jederzeit unseren Anteil, wenn sich der Unglückliche, den wir *bemitleiden* sollen, *aus eigner unverzeihlicher Schuld* in sein Verderben gestürzt hat."—"Es wird jederzeit der höchsten Vollkommenheit

¹ These italics are Schiller's, the others are my own.

seines Werks Abbruch thun wenn der tragische Dichter nicht ohne einen Bösewicht auskommen kann, und wenn er gezwungen ist, die *Grösze des Leidens von der Grösze der Bosheit herzuleiten*.—"Zu einem weit höheren Grad steigt das Mitleid, wenn sowohl derjenige, welcher leidet, als derjenige, welcher Leiden verursacht, Gegenstände desselben werden. Dies kann nur dann geschehen, wenn der letztere weder unsren Hass noch unsre Verachtung erregt, sondern wider seine Neigung dahin gebracht wird, Urheber des Unglücks zu werden."

Now it is true that in 1792 the youthful poet of freedom was still so vigorously alive in Schiller as to dictate to him the sentence: "eine blinde Unterwürfigkeit unter das Schicksal (ist) immer demütigend und kränkend für freie sich selbst bestimmende Wesen" (ed. Goedeke, vol. 10, p. 26). That, however, even at that time Schiller had a high opinion of what he considered to be the æsthetic advantages of fate in tragedy is plainly shown by the statements leading up to the opinion just quoted, especially by the very suggestive paragraph ("Aber auf der höchsten und letzten Stufe" etc.), which immediately follows.

As a matter of fact an uninterrupted line of development can be traced from 1792 to 1803, and there can be no doubt that even in 1792 the ground of Schiller's artistic consciousness was well prepared for the later reception (in 1795 and following years) of seeds that were soon to bear fruit in some of the products of the *Balladenjahr*, in *Wallenstein*, and in the *Jungfrau*, and which reached their fullest development in *Die Braut von Messina* of 1803.

In the light of these facts, no doubt seems permissible concerning the meaning of the passage in the letter of Nov. 28, 1796. Besides, Prof. Winkler stops his quotation from this letter rather too soon, for the omitted last sentence is, perhaps, even more to the point than what precedes:

"Mich tröstet hier aber einigermassen das Beispiel des Macbeth, wo das *Schicksal* ebenfalls weit weniger Schuld hat als der *Mensch*, dass er zu Grunde geht."²

If, in this context, *Schicksal* does not mean something for which man is *not* responsible, something, therefore, that cannot be "a necessary expression of his character," then the passage is devoid of all meaning.

² The italics are mine.

Quite the same is true of lines 109-110 of the prologue. The art of the poet, in order to bring the hero closer to our hearts (that is, for the sake of better securing the effect of tragic pity), frees him from part of his responsibility and *wälzt die grösze Hälfe seiner Schuld den unglückseligen Gestirnen zu*. Hence the latter phrase cannot refer to a necessary result of the hero's character. For if the larger part of his guilt were made to depend upon his character, what would become of the contrast in which it is meant to stand to the remaining part, the responsibility for which certainly is to rest on the hero?

Thus we are forced to admit that in these two, and in other similar passages, Schiller is plainly thinking of some agency not within that sphere of human action for which we hold the doer personally accountable. On the other hand, this is not the place for determining—if it really can be definitely determined—whether he has in mind the blind chance of outward circumstances over which we have no control, or the actual 'fate' of either the ancients or moderns,³ or Goethe's conception of *das Dämonische* in man (to which several passages in *Wallenstein* seem to point), or, finally, a world-soul, in contemplation of which

"Unzufriedenheit mit dem Schicksal hinwegfällt, und sich in die Ahndung oder lieber in ein deutliches Bewusstsein einer teleologischen Verknüpfung der Dinge, einer erhabenen Ordnung, eines gütigen Willens verliert." (*Ueber die tragische Kunst, Werke*, ed. Goedeke, vol. 10, p. 27.)

It would lead too far if I were to continue this line of thought more in detail, and I confine myself to two general inferences:

1. The attitude which one assumes with regard to what was Schiller's theory and purpose in this matter, extends its radiating influence in all directions and largely determines one's relation to almost all the other mooted phases of the drama: the characters of *Wallenstein* and *Octavio* (from Prof. Winkler's standpoint the former losing in sympathy, the latter gaining, while from the opposite point of view the reverse is the case), the significance of the astrological motif, the question of the genuineness of the *Butterbrief*, the *Wallenstein*-

³ Comp. Flath, *Die Schicksalsidee in der deutschen Tragödie*, p. 18.

Octavio dream,⁴ and the economic value of the Max-Thekla action. The latter Prof. Winkler judges almost solely from the ethical viewpoint, without calling equal attention to the purely artistic purpose (the only one stressed by Schiller, I believe) of furnishing relief scenes and of "rounding out a certain circle of human experience." As soon, however, as one judges the introduction of Max and Thekla from the ethical point of view, one's estimate necessarily becomes the direct result of one's general attitude on the above-discussed question of fate. Prof. Winkler assigns to these scenes above all the office of "accentuating the guilt of the hero," although admitting that they also serve to elevate his personality. From my stand point the former cannot possibly be the case and, aside from their purely artistic functions, they can only serve to render the hero more sympathetic to us.

2. It is a point which, I believe, needs no special emphasis that in consequence of the view upheld in the above remarks one need not consider Schiller's *Wallenstein* as a tragedy of fate. At any rate, this is not done by Hettner,⁵ who, to my mind, has said some of the best and truest things about the drama, which he admires no less than I do. On the other hand, it is by no means impossible that one should hold the view represented by Prof. Winkler and many of the most prominent German commentators—that is, that there are no fatalistic traits in the drama as it stands—and yet admit the unmistakable plainness of what Schiller means when he discusses with Goethe *das Schicksal* with reference to *Wallenstein*. Such an attitude, while not my own, is by no means inconsistent, and would simply mean that a true poet's instinctive practice carried the day over philosophical theorizing, that the historical basis and older conception of a dramatic fable proved stronger than all later attempts to infuse into it elements originally

⁴ Prof. Winkler seems to treat this point too lightly when, on p. lxvi, he states that "it is not at all remarkable that two generals . . . should dream of the impending conflict." Surely, it is not, but equally surely is there a great deal more involved than just this bare fact.

⁵ Not only in his *Literaturgeschichte d. 18. Jh.*, but also in *Die romantische Schule in ihrem inneren Zusammenhang mit Goethe und Schiller*, p. 101 ff.

foreign to it, that in the Schiller of 1797 and 1798 there was enough left of the youthful "poet of freedom" to serve as an effective antidote against all aesthetic preferences for fatalistic theories.

As I have indicated, this is not my personal view; from my standpoint, I feel forced to admit that elements of a romantic fatalism have found their way into the grandest drama of German literature, although certainly not to the extent that Schiller seemed to think when he wrote of *die gröszere Hälfte*.

The text of Prof. Winkler's edition is an excellent specimen of the most painstaking work, almost wholly free—as is indeed the entire book—from typographical errors and the many small inaccuracies that so often beset first editions. We have noticed only the following: p. lii, l. 9 from below; p. 317, l. 23; p. 331, l. 6; p. 335, l. 8; p. 390, l. 10 from below.

The notes occupy over one hundred and ten closely printed pages and are full and elaborate; but only in very few instances (for example, *Lager*, l. 48, l. 126) do they furnish information that is of no practical value for even the fullest appreciation of the text. A few notes (for example, Prol., l. 3; *Lager*, ll. 7 and 14) seem too elementary for students reading *Wallenstein*. On the other hand, there are a few cases where a note is called for: *daurend* for *dauernd* (Prol., l. 39); *sah* (Picc., l. 2269); *kläresten* (Picc., l. 2342); *Geschichten* (Tod, l. 326). On the whole, however, the annotation is both scholarly and practical, constantly having in view the actual needs of college students as well as of such teachers as have no access to additional reference literature. There are numerous references to the works of Schiller, Goethe, and others, but since the passages referred to are generally not quoted, they will in practice, if not by necessity, remain inaccessible to most students. It would seem, indeed, that in a text for students, if references are considered of real value, they should be given in full, unless they be much too long.

Lack of space renders it impossible, at present, to take up in detail a number of individual passages that invite discussion. This will be done, however, in one of the next issues.

In conclusion we consider it our duty again to express to the editor our full appreciation of the excellency of his work and to thank him, even though on many of the important questions we belong to "the other side," for having furnished us a thoroughly good working edition of *Wallenstein*.

A. R. HOHLFELD.
Vanderbilt University.

DANISH-NORWEDIAN-ENGLISH
DICTIONARY.

Dansk-Norsk-Engelsk Ordbog of A. LARSEN.
Tredie Udgave. Gennemset of Johannes
Magnussen. Köbenhavn, Gyldendal, 1897.
687 pp.

THE last edition of Larsen's *Ordbog*, revised by Johannes Magnussen, does not differ materially from the third edition of 1888, except in the normalization of the spelling. In the earlier editions the traditional spelling had been adhered to, but Magnussen has adopted the orthographic standards recommended by the ministry of culture. In the edition of 1888 Larsen embodied about 50,000 technical terms and Danish and Norwegian words that had not previously appeared in any Danish-Norwegian dictionary. Highly valuable as the work was, it left much to be hoped for in that a mass of Norwegian words that are in common use and are found in the works of Ibsen, Björnson, and Kielland had been omitted. The failure to include specifically Norwegian words occurring in works as widely read as Ibsen's *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*, Björnson's *Synnøve Solbakken*, *Arne* and *En Glad Gut*, and Kielland's *Skipper Worse* was a fault that should have been remedied in the revised edition; but while some new material has been added it is to be regretted that so many omissions still occur. We note here the following, from the three works of Björnson mentioned above: *Aan*, as in *Hö-aannen*, the hay-making season; *dætte*, to fail; *ende*, as in *ende op*, straight up; *fye op*, to flare up; *Fark*, a ne'er do well; *Gnæg*; *hövelig*, suitable; *kovne*, to smother; *kringmælt*, said of one who speaks fast; *leike*, to play, Danish *lege*; *Leite*, time; *Læm*, an upper room; *mörklet*, Dan. *mörkladen*; *Nab*, a peg; *Regle*, a story;

Rid, a while; *rape*, to crumble, fall; *skamfare*, to damage; *Sprølag*, written *Sporlag* by Jonas Sie, rumor, report; from Ibsen's *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*; *Bos*, chaff; *Brot*; *Bö*, *dagblak*, *Frænke*, *forskingre*, *klarne*, *kende*, in the sense to grope about; *med*, also; *nem*; *nöre*, to kindle; *Nemme*, cleverness, talent; *plent*, just, entirely; *Sprike*, crack; *stödt*, always; *Spjeld* and *Yr*, and the word *löien* from *Skipper Worse*. Under *lei* should also have been given the definition 'troublesome,' which is a very common meaning of the word. The Norwegian *kvas* is given together with the Danish *hvas*, but *Gagn* and the derivatives *Ugagn* and *tilgagns* (Danish *Gavn*, *Ugavn*, *tilgavns*) are omitted; so also *gnage*, Danish *gnave*. The dialect word *trive* is given but the words *Bil*, a while, *bjart*, *kverve*, *fram*, *oppi*, *overlag*, very, *sövne*, and *tröisom*, merry, interesting, all of which are found in Ibsen or Björnson are omitted. Under *god* and *ilde* the Norwegian idioms *god til*, able to, and *at blive ilde ved*, to become ill at ease, embarrassed, should have been included. *Paa Lag*, about, as in *Hvormeget paa Lag*, and *paa Stel*, beside one's self, which occur in Björnson, should have been given. Larsen's *Ordbog* is too well known to need any special recommendation. It is an excellent work in spite of the omissions noted, though it is hoped that the next edition will include all words found in the works of the chief Norwegian and Danish writers of the nineteenth century.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Iowa.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Études sur la littérature française. Par RENÉ DOUMIC. Quatrième Série. Librairie Académique. Perrin et Cie., 1901.

M. BRUNETIÈRE is certainly one of the strongest minds in contemporary France. The large number of his enemies in the literary world and elsewhere would alone suffice to prove it. His opinions, thanks especially to the *Revue des deux Mondes*, have now been the property of the French people for a good many years. It was impossible that the persistent repetition of the same ideas, presented, as they were by

the great critic in a style which was forcible, even if a trifle heavy, should remain without effect. In recent years, several well-known writers of France have changed entirely their attitude towards important problems discussed in their country (Lemaître, Bourget, Barrès, etc.), and their new points of view are very much the same as the one long represented by M. Brunetièrre; namely, a kind of opportunism in political and ecclesiastical matters, which may well be unattractive in itself, but is, it must be admitted, deserving of attention as very diplomatic at this moment in the history of France. M. Doumic's book *Études sur la littérature française* (4. série) is a remarkable illustration of this invading spirit of Brunetièrre. The great currents of thought of the Director of the *Revue des deux Mondes* are all there. Nay, even in the language we notice traces of his inspiration. For instance, there is hardly one page of M. Doumic's book where the reader does not run across an *aussi bien* placed at the beginning of a sentence. *Aussi bien* is the most irrelevant conjunction that can be used, but it has been repeated over and over again by M. Brunetièrre until finally other writers have accepted it, and the public, having become accustomed to it, no longer notices it.

Let us come to the content of M. Doumic's *Études*.

We notice first the author's attitude towards cosmopolitanism in literature. The strongest words do not frighten him.

"La manie de l'exotisme s'est déchaînée, intransigeante, intolérante et sectaire, manie qui a ses illuminés, ses fanatiques et ses convulsionnaires. Voyez lorsqu'ils sont dans l'accès de leur délice, les tolstoïsants, les ibséniens, les nietzschiéens; mais surtout n'essayez pas de les calmer . . . le cosmopolitisme a été pour beaucoup d'esprits distingués de notre temps l'école de l'anarchie."

Or elsewhere :

"Peut-être y a-t-il lieu de discuter sur ses avantages ou ses inconvénients dans l'ordre intellectuel; ce qui ne fait pas doute, et ce qu'il importe de signaler dans un intérêt de préservation sociale, c'est l'immoralité du cosmopolitisme."

It may be well to remark that M. Doumic can actually refer to the authority of a number of men of high standing in literature and science. It seems as if the death of M. Joseph

Texte the energetic and genial representative of the opposite tendency, had been the signal for an outburst of enthusiasm on the side of nationalism. M. Doumic points out with delight (*L'Education dans l'Université*), that the speeches at the "distribution des prix" in the different Lycées of Paris last June, agreed in blaming the exotic tastes of the French of to-day indulged in to the injury of the national spirit. Let us, they say, remain true to the French ideals :

"Tandis que partout ailleurs, en Angleterre, en Allemagne, en Amérique, l'enseignement contribue à développer, à fortifier, à exalter le sentiment anglais, allemand, américain, que l'Université de France ne s'expose pas à mériter quelque jour le reproche d'avoir préparé des générations de dupes."

This feeling in France is most natural. No nation likes to see her people deserting the writers of the country and looking abroad for other ideals. On the other hand, the fact exists, there must be some reason for it. There are no more fabristic people than the French; they have this reputation and deserve it. They would be the last ones, it would seem, to read foreign books if they could find at home the intellectual food they are longing for. The past is a testimony to this assertion; French people up to the present time as a rule had always proved utterly ignorant of the literary movement of other nations. One cannot account for the present tendency, as does M. Doumic in his book, by suggesting that it is a mere question of fashion. Neither the broad diffusion of the evil, nor its duration, can be explained in this way. The simplest, and indeed the only explanation, is that the literature of to-day in France lacks that spirit which alone would make it worthy to be cultivated. The best demonstration that this is actually so will be found precisely with M. Doumic and his friends. It may even be put down as a second characteristic feature of Brunetièrre, that these critics seem to make it a point to attack all recent attempts at novelty in French literature. They, more than anybody else, found fault successively with Naturalism, Psychology, Symbolism, Dilettantism and all other *-isms* of recent years. When by chance they discover something in the younger generations which is not altogether bad, they are

apt to point out that it has been borrowed or imitated from older French authors—a very characteristic suggestion as we shall see further on. Thus M. Doumic will show us the theatre going back, after the vagaries of our century, by way of the psychological drama to the ideal drama of the seventeenth century (*Un livre sur la Comédie Nouvelle*). The lyrics of the school of Symbolism, when they put aside the naturalistic acceptance of the world and the descriptive and cold poetry of the Parnassians, in order to develop the emotional part of the individual, show a tendency to go back to the Lamartinian lyrism. Even our "mal, fin de siècle" is not very different from the "mal du siècle" of Chateaubriand, Senancour, Musset . . . Only, of course, the men of the present are always inferior to those of the past (see, for instance, *Le bilan d'un génération*, p. 300-301).

Thus, if there is no good, or at least if the only things which are not entirely bad are spoiled by the new authors in France, why should M. Doumic blame people for being interested in foreign authors? His sometimes violent attacks upon the adherents of cosmopolitanism in literature may seem all the more out of place since he cannot help occasionally admiring them. In a fit of enthusiasm he goes so far as to compare the heroes in Tolstoi's last novel with those of Rabelais (see *Résurrection du Comte Tolstoi*), a judgment at which even a cosmopolitan-minded reader may well stand amazed.

If then he fights against the reading of foreign literature, it must be because he has some special end in view. In fact M. Doumic is inclined to take very much the same position towards the books of strangers as that which we have found him assuming towards recent French authors. In so doing he again agrees with other powerful nationalist critics of France. At the end of the article on Georges Sand, he does for Russian literature exactly—although not so extensively—what Lemaitre did a few years ago for Scandinavian literature, in an article of the *Revue des deux Mondes* which has remained famous; namely, that the most celebrated of these authors of Northern Europe, or Eastern Europe, took their ideas originally from French literature, and only

developed their theories in their own fashion. Tourgueniev, Pouchkine, Dostoiewski, Lermontow, Tolstoi and others owe the very best part of their works to Georges Sand. So after all what the French public enjoys in foreign authors, is, though they do not know it, French thought. Conclusion: why not stay at home and enjoy these ideas in the original?

But, as we have said above that the contemporary literature in France does not meet the demand, there remains nothing else but to go to the authors of the past. This is just what M. Brunetière and M. Doumic want. They have other cares than literature in their books and articles; they aim at a reorganization of France awarding to a special social ideal, this ideal is the France of the past, more plainly still Catholic France. Our nineteenth century has been a time of political disorder and anarchy; so, too, with its literature. Therefore, what the French public needs is to assimilate by reading the spirit of the authors of the centuries when order prevailed in the country. M. Brunetière's cult for the classical literature of the seventeenth century, and especially for the catholic Bossuet whom he constantly holds up to his fellow-countrymen, is well-known. Classical literature, then, is recommended for the general public. As for students, the men who are to be at the head of France to-morrow, one ought to be more careful still. Even the seventeenth century is not always the most beneficial reading for them. It will be much safer to cultivate, according to a venerable tradition, the Latin and Greek literatures. The object is to avoid open discussion of all the problems of the day, in order to prevent conflicts—especially religious conflicts which have proved so fatal to the welfare of the country. Keeping to this path M. Doumic succeeds in presenting his stupendous claim under the name of *Tolérance*. Of course "Tolerance" actually means to refrain from attacks on the ideas of the Catholic church; free-thinking has not been altogether favorable to the religion prevailing in France, so let us suppress free-thinking. It with a most admirable dexterity and subtlety of dialectics that M. Doumic brings the reader to this conclusion, without of course committing the mistake of expressing himself in so many words.

But this is not all: as if it were the most natural thing in the world M. Doumic expects the Université itself to commit this naïve suicide. I quote a few sentences from the suggestive chapter on *L'éducation dans l'Université*. First the question whether neutrality is a good thing. Yes indeed, answers our critic, especially when applied to the enemies of clericalism.

"Cette neutralité, nous ne songeons guère à contester qu'elle soit nécessaire: nous nous plairions plutôt que dans un ordre d'enseignement, l'enseignement primaire, elle soit depuis si longtemps continûment, cyniquement et officiellement violée. La neutralité est dans l'état actuel la formule du libéralisme."

This last sentence is true, without doubt. Only M. Doumic is just as little anxious to be faithful to true neutrality in the Université as his adversaries themselves are. In other words, if the latter favor anti-clericalism under the name of neutrality, M. Doumic asks the Université to favor clericalism under the same name of neutrality; he would like very much to go still further in his claims, if he could do it without exposing his views too openly:

"La neutralité scolaire a de solides avantages. Mais on voit aussi quels en sont les inconvénients. Sur toutes les questions essentielles le professeur est obligé de s'abstenir. Sur celles-là même qui intéressent la vie de la conscience, il est tenu de n'avoir pas d'opinion et de laisser croire qu'il ne pense rien. Il n'est ni pour, ni contre. Qu'il ne fasse un pas ni à droite ni à gauche! Qu'il ne bouge pas! Qu'il se surveille! Mais à tant se surveiller, on perd toute hardiesse. Ne pas bouger, c'est être paralysé. On n'agit pas en s'abstenant. Cette impossibilité de se référer à un corps de doctrines et de sortir du vague, c'est le grand obstacle auquel se heurte l'Université."

After all he grants that neutrality is hardly to be dispensed with. But while advocating it, he cannot help doing his best to have it actually practised in such a way as to favor his own ideas. Here I must be allowed a new quotation:

"Pour qu'un professeur donne un enseignement fort efficace, il faut qu'il se sente libre, maître de tout dire, de pousser ses idées jusqu'au bout, de livrer le fond de sa pensée. Cette liberté, il peut l'avoir avec les textes antiques, il ne l'a pas avec les textes français eux-mêmes. C'est ce qui a été excellélement mis en lumière dans ce passage de la déposition de M. Brune-

tière:" "Les textes qui servent de base à l'enseignement classique étant en général antérieurs au christianisme ont ce grand avantage de n'être pas confessionnels . . . Il est très difficile à un professeur impartial, mais qui, pourtant a ses idées, ses convictions à lui, d'expliquer un peu à fond les *Lettres provinciales*. Il lui est encore très difficile de parler avec liberté de l'*Histoire des Variations*, très difficile également d'expliquer des textes de Voltaire, de Diderot, ou même la *Profession de foi du Vicaire Savoyard*. Vous mettez ce professeur dans une situation gênante; il est exposé à chaque instant à faire appel aux passions qui commencent à se faire jour chez les élèves, ou à donner un enseignement qui blessera les familles."

Who will not see through that? Either the professor in discussing ancient authors will say all that he thinks, and then the students will be very stupid indeed if they cannot apply it to the questions of the present time; or the professors will not say all they think, which means in other words, that they will give up free discussion. Of course there are different ways of explaining opinions; but why should not we go on the supposition that the professors will always be tactful? Then the authors used in class, whether ancient or modern, will not have the slightest influence upon the teaching. If, on the other hand, the professors do not speak tactfully, then reform them, but not the University.

But even suppose we could take the proposition seriously, what is going to be the practical value of a University in which all discussions of the problems of the day are carefully avoided? What is to become of the books published on social or religious matters? Are the students not to read them? Or are the authors to give up writing in order to make it easier for the representatives of clericalism?

Thus if

"Renoncer à la tradition telle qu'elle s'est d'elle-même établie, ce serait fausser l'esprit de l'Université, y faire souffler tous les vents de la dispute, et, en ouvrant les portes du lycée aux bruits de la mêlée contemporaine y ruiner jusqu'à la possibilité d'une éducation."

Anarchy may probably seem preferable to some generously-minded people, who prefer progress with war, to a stand-still and peace. On the other hand, we repeat what we said at

the beginning of our article: It may well be that the remedy proposed by M. Brunetière and his followers, is the only one to save the situation for the present. It is not our affair to decide as to that. We have only tried to present their stand-point in its true light.

We have said nothing of the first set of articles in M. Doumic's book, those on Voltaire, Napoleon, the love stories of Balzac and Michelet. They are entertaining accounts of interesting researches in history and politics, but have little to do with literature as such.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

GRILLPARZER AND ROSTAND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—During the winter's work I have come across several points of contact between Grillparzer and Rostand. Permit me to call attention to two passages in *Cyrano de Bergerac* where the French poet is certainly indebted to the German. In *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, Leander pleading Hero for a kiss says:

Und dann—sie legen Lipp' an Lippe
Ich sah es wohl—und flüstern so sich zu,
Was zu geheim für die geschwätz'ge Luft.
Mein Mund sei Mund, der deine sei dein Ohr!
Leih mir dein Ohr für meine stumme Sprache!
Cotta 7, 59: Act iii.

In *Cyrano de Bergerac*, Cyrano pleading Roxane likewise for a kiss, for Christian, says:

Un baiser, mais à tout prendre, qu'est-ce?
Un serment fait d'un peu plus près, une promesse
Plus précise, un aveu qui veut se confirmer,
C'est un secret qui prend la bouche pour oreille.
Act iii, p. 125.

And as Hero says half-offended, half-pleased:

Das soll nicht sein!

So Roxane

Taisez-vous!

Grillparzer in his poem to Katharina Froehlich, *Allgegenwart*, says of her eyes:

Wo ich bin, fern und nah,
Stehen zwei Augen da,

Dunkelhell,
Blitzesschnell,
Schimmernd wie Felsenquell,
Schattenumkrinzt.
Wer in die Sonne sieht,
Weiss es, wie mir geschieht;
Schliesst er das Auge sein,
Schwarz und klein,
Sieht er zwei Pünktlein
Uebrall vor sich.
So auch mir immerdar
Zeigt sich dies Augenpaar,
Wachend in Busch und Feld,
Nachts, wenn mich Schlaf befüllt;
Nichts in der ganzen Welt
Hüllt mir es ein.
Cotta i, 167.

Cyrano uses the same image for Roxane's hair:

Je sais que l'an dernier, un jour, le douze mai,
Pour sortir le matin tu changes de coiffure!
J'ai tellement pris pour clarté ta chevelure
Que comme, lorsqu'on a trop fixé le soleil,
On voit sur toute chose ensuite un rond vermeil,
Sur tout, quand j'ai quitté les feux dont tu m'inondes,
Mon regard ébloui pose des tâches blondes!
iii, p. 121.

Certainly these two parallel passages occurring in the same scene show Rostand's acquaintance with and appreciation of Grillparzer.

EDWARD MEYER.

Munich, Germany.

REPUTE OF THE HESSIANS IN AMERICA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Der Unterzeichneter, mit einer kleinen Studie über den Leumund seiner hessischen Landsleute beschäftigt, ersucht die verehrlichen Leser dieser Zeitschrift um den brieflichen Nachweis sprichwörtlicher Redensarten und vulgärer oder dialektischer Ausdrücke, die sich auf die "Hessians" im allgemeinen oder die hessischen Hilfstruppen Englands im Unabhängigkeitskriege im besondern beziehen. Er ist auf Derbheiten gefasst und wird auch das unfreundlichste dankbar, mit Interesse und guter Laune aufnehmen.

EDWARD SCHRÖDER.

Universität Marburg
(Hessen).